

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 14th October, 1992

Mr Speaker (The Hon. Kevin Richard Rozzoli) took the chair at 2.15 p.m.

Mr Speaker offered the Prayer.

MATTER OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Mr Speaker advised the House that he had received from the honourable member for Drummoyne notice of a matter of public importance, which would be set down for debate at the conclusion of formal business.

POLICE ADMINISTRATION

Suspension of certain standing and sessional orders, by leave, agreed to.

Mr FAHEY (Southern Highlands - Premier, and Treasurer) [2.16]: I move:

That:

- (1) A Joint Select Committee be appointed to inquire into whether mechanisms of accountability, the existing roles of and reporting relationships between the Minister for Police, the Police Board of New South Wales, the Inspector General of Police and the Commissioner of Police are adequate to ensure an efficient, effective and accountable Police Service in New South Wales and may make such recommendations for reform as it considers desirable.
- (2) In conducting the Inquiry:
 - (a) the committee shall have regard to the circumstances which resulted in the resignation of the Honourable E. P. Pickering, MLC as Minister for Police and Emergency Services; and
 - (b) the committee shall not duplicate the examination by the Ombudsman of the matters outlined in the Report by the Ombudsman to the Parliament of 29th September, 1992 about the complaints by Mrs Carolyn Rigg about the conduct of the New South Wales Police Service until such time as the Ombudsman's Report is completed.
- (3) That the committee shall consist of six members of the Legislative Assembly and four members of the Legislative Council.
- (4) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Standing Orders of either House:

- (a) that Mr Anderson, Mr Hatton, Mr Merton, Mr D. L. Page, Mr Whelan and Mr Yabsley be appointed to serve on such committee as members of the Legislative Assembly;
 - (b) that the Legislative Council members shall be two members supporting the Government and two members not supporting the Government.
- (5) That the Legislative Council be requested to nominate the Chairman of the committee.
- (6) That at any meeting of the committee six members shall constitute a quorum, provided that the committee shall meet as a joint committee at all times.

Page 6845

- (7) That the Chairman of the committee shall have a deliberative and casting vote.
- (8) That the committee have leave to sit during the sittings or any adjournment of either or both Houses; to adjourn from place to place; to have power to take evidence and send for persons and papers; and to report from time to time.
- (9) That the committee make an interim report by 20th November, 1992.
- (10) That should either or both Houses stand adjourned and the committee agree to any report before the Houses resume sitting:
- (a) the committee have leave to send any such report, minutes and evidence taken before it to the Clerk of the House;
 - (b) the documents shall be printed and published and the Clerk shall forthwith take such action as is necessary to give effect to the order of the House; and
 - (c) the documents shall be laid upon the Table of the House at its next sitting.

The motion that the Government has put forward today to establish this parliamentary inquiry is to ensure public confidence in the accountability of the Police Service. It would be clear to all honourable members that on 22nd September when I informed the House that the Minister for Police had resigned as Minister for Police and had been appointed as Minister for Justice it was because of a set of circumstances in respect of the relationship between the then Minister for Police and the Commissioner for Police. Since that time a lot has been said, both of a factual nature and of a nature which would clearly give some concern to those who are interested in ensuring that the Police Service in this State is accountable to the Executive Government and through the Executive Government to the people of New South Wales through the Parliament. In the past I have said I considered it entirely appropriate that the Ombudsman complete his report into what is known as the Rigg affair. I made it clear - particularly when the Ombudsman had taken over the inquiry as is within his power and was referred to in this House yesterday - that I believed it was entirely appropriate that the Parliament should

await the outcome of the Ombudsman's report. That report will be made available to the Parliament at an appropriate time.

At all times I have said I would look with some considerable interest at that report and that the Government was vitally concerned to see that those circumstances, which are very regrettable circumstances, were matters which should properly be addressed by the Parliament when the report was available. During the past 24 hours it has become clear to me, and particularly after the Opposition gave notice yesterday of an intention to attempt to establish a judicial inquiry, that that was not the appropriate way in which to deal with this matter. At the same time, following discussion with the Independents, it also became clear to me that they were genuinely concerned about this issue and that the community had concerns about the accountability of the Police Service in this State. For those reasons it is appropriate for the Parliament to proceed with this parliamentary inquiry in terms of the notice which I have now given.

Contained in the motion are matters which had already been commenced to be addressed by this Government and the matters which the parliamentary inquiry will consider are matters which the Government is more than happy to have input into. They include matters that the Government had in hand, and I am referring specifically to the relationship between the Minister, the Commissioner, the Police Board and the proposed Ministry of Police. It is important that the Parliament should be satisfied that the Police Board is capable of delivering a proper reporting process, a role in which it has a responsibility within its charter. It is important that this House should examine whether

Page 6846
that charter as constituted is sufficiently broad to bring about the desired result. Most of all it is important that the public is satisfied that all these things are in place in a proper fashion. A parliamentary inquiry will satisfy the public because a parliamentary inquiry that is conducted in a constructive fashion will undoubtedly lead to a better administration of the Police Service in this State.

This matter is not about politics. It should not be about politics; it should be about achieving a result that can give the public in this State confidence in its Police Service. All honourable members would appreciate the need for the community to have confidence in its police force. Since the resignation of the former Minister for Police we have seen in the public arena a series of statements in relation to this incident by members of the Opposition that have implications attached to them. That is not in the interests of the community. Yesterday the honourable member for Liverpool suggested that an officer from the Department of Community Services, acting on behalf of the then Minister for Community Services, had called the Shoalhaven District Memorial Hospital three times to inquire about the condition of Angus Rigg. I replied at the time that I had no knowledge of these events. But I have since made inquiries and have been advised by the director-general of that department that no officer from the Department of Community Services made any such inquiry. As a result, the then Minister for Community Services was not briefed on the matter.

Mr Anderson: Did the Premier check the hospital records?

Mr FAHEY: The honourable member should be patient. I said earlier that honourable members opposite continue to play a game of politics. That is not in the interests of the people involved in this issue. It is not in the interests of the victim or the family members of the victim for honourable members opposite to play these games.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Kiama to order.

Mr FAHEY: No officer from the Department of Community Services called the hospital. The honourable member for Liverpool had his facts wrong. Inquiries were made by an officer from the Office of Juvenile Justice. Subsequently, the responsible Minister, the former Minister for Community Services - not the present Minister for Justice - was given a briefing. The then Minister for Community Services has since advised me that he did not discuss the Rigg case with the former Minister for Police, as it appeared that the issue was being handled correctly by the department. Honourable members should remember that this was an operational matter. At the time there was no major public discussion concerning this matter, regrettable though that might be. As I have said, there is a need for the community to have confidence in its police force.

It is for those reasons that the Government has put forward this motion to establish a joint select committee. A joint select committee is necessary for the purposes of ensuring that the former Minister for Police can appear before it. A committee comprised only of members of this House of Parliament would prevent such an event occurring. I do not want to see such an inquiry bogged down by technicalities. From the terms of reference I have announced to the Parliament all honourable members would appreciate that there may well be a need for the Rigg affair to be brought forward when the Ombudsman's report comes before this Parliament. That has not been precluded. I said from the outset that, if that was necessary, the Government would not walk away from it. I have indicated that concerns have been expressed to me, both in public and in private, about the role of the board. On a number of occasions I have demonstrated that, regardless of the criteria used in the reporting processes, it did not give the

Page 6847

community confidence and left a lot to be desired. It is important for this inquiry to take place at an early date. The interim committee report, which will be tabled in this Parliament on 20th November, will demonstrate that that process is being followed and it will establish where the matter is going.

Before members of the Opposition start calling for the former Minister for Police - the present Minister for Justice - to stand down, it should be made abundantly clear that there is nothing untoward that I am aware of. At all times I have kept honourable members informed of this matter. At no stage has the Government attempted to walk away from the facts, as they are known to it. So let us hear no more about standing down the former Minister for Police. That is not what this inquiry is about and it is not appropriate in any shape or form. If the Opposition seeks to politicise the issue, it obviously is not interested in achieving a constructive result, which I hope is what all members of the committee of the Parliament want to achieve.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Drummoyne to order.

Mr FAHEY: I was impressed by the arguments put forward by the Independents in relation to this matter.

[Interruption]

The outburst by the Opposition makes it obvious that the same arguments put by the Independents to the Opposition were treated with contempt. If that is the attitude the Opposition wants to take, it can go right ahead, but I assure its members the matter is serious.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order.

Mr FAHEY: The arguments put forward by the Independent members included a statement by the honourable member for South Coast that he was interested in seeing that the systems were right; he was not interested in finding victims. So far as I am concerned, and so far as members of the Government are concerned, such a statement carries a lot of weight when it comes to matters as serious as this. I hope that the attitude of the Opposition that prompted the imbecilic laughter in response to a statement I made earlier will be reconsidered in the light of the seriousness of this particular matter. The Government believes it is important that this issue is dealt with properly and in the best interests of the people of this State. I assure honourable members that the Government will co-operate fully to assist the committee to make the determinations that it must make in relation to the structure, reporting, linkages that I referred to, and delineations of responsibility to ensure that ultimately police in this State will in no way be prevented from dealing with operational matters - as they should not be - and to ensure that there is accountability of all members of the police force, from the commissioner down, in terms of appointments and other matters about which the people in this State should have some say and, ultimately, some confidence when decisions are made. I look forward to a constructive inquiry, and to ensuring that the inquiry is given the respect and attention it deserves, as I believe it will, from all honourable members of Parliament. I give an assurance that the Government is interested in the right result and nothing less.

Mr CARR (Maroubra - Leader of the Opposition) [2.32]: One month after this affair began this Government has finally conceded the public inquiry that the Opposition has called for from the very start. It has been dragged, kicking and screaming, to the
Page 6848

inevitable inquiry. The one reason the Government is taking the risk of bringing Ted Pickering before a parliamentary inquiry and that is that the Premier faced a censure motion if he did not agree to it. He had no concern for accountability of the police force or with the strong arguments presented by the Independents - particularly those of the honourable member for South Coast. He had one concern: his fear of facing censure. Every argument to support a parliamentary inquiry into this matter was manifest on Friday, 18th September, when police commissioner Tony Lauer flatly contradicted Ted Pickering: the commissioner asserting that briefing material relating to the Angus Rigg case had in fact been sent to the Minister's office the day after the incident. On Saturday, 19th September, when the former police Minister admitted for the first time in a press release that briefing material about this affair might have been sent to him, there was just as strong a case for a parliamentary or judicial inquiry.

The case was just as strong on Monday, 21st September, when the Premier convened a meeting with the police Minister and the commissioner which resulted in the Minister's sacking. If there is a case for an inquiry now, why was it not manifest to the Premier then? The argument is simple. Now he faces the prospect of censure by the Parliament. That has shifted the ground from under his feet. On Tuesday, 22nd September, when Ted Pickering, in his final address to the Parliament as police Minister, accused the police force of setting him up, the case for an inquiry was every bit as compelling as the Premier has now discovered it to be. In that emotional speech the then police Minister backtracked on his assertions of the previous week. He conceded that an internal affairs document handed to him in a meeting with the assistant commissioner and the Inspector General was now missing, possibly removed from a safe in his ministerial office. These allegations of extraordinary seriousness were confirmed, repeated, and underlined by a prominent backbencher, Mr Duncan Gay.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Coogee to order.

Mr CARR: If the Premier is contemplating making Mr Duncan Gay the

chairman of this parliamentary inquiry, he should have another think, because Mr Duncan Gay will be called as a witness before this inquiry.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Premier to order.

Mr CARR: If an upper House colleague of the Premier asserts in this Parliament that the police set up the former Minister, that matter should be investigated. He must be asked what evidence led him to that conclusion. Later that night, according to a report on Channel 10 news, Ted Pickering, having resigned as police Minister, blurted to a gathering of politicians, staff and journalists that he feared police would kill him. I submit that whether he was speaking metaphorically or literally there was a compelling case for an inquiry as soon as that utterance was made. The case for an inquiry was strengthened the next day when the police Minister did not deny using those words but said he meant them figuratively.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Bulli to order.

Mr CARR: That lame excuse was not convincing to the Premier, who then invented another one. He said his Minister had to be excused because effectively he was drunk. In the recent history of this Parliament there has never been a more pathetic defence for a lame ministerial performance than the assertion by this Premier that Mr Pickering was drunk.

Page 6849

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much interjection from both sides of the Chamber. I call the Minister for the Environment to order.

Mr CARR: That night Ted Pickering's secret plan to remove the police commissioner, which was set out in a Cabinet minute, was withdrawn from all Ministers after Channel 10 broke the story in its 5 p.m. news. Yesterday the Opposition revealed that briefing notes on the Rigg matter were not only hand delivered to the Minister's office but also they were faxed to both his residences.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! On a number of occasions I have reminded honourable members about the level of conversation in the Chamber. If members wish to converse, they will do so outside the Chamber.

Mr CARR: The former Minister's pathetic defence was that the fax machine or machines had run out of paper. That is an original defence. Not even the honourable member for Mosman had invented it earlier this year when he ran through all the gamut of excuses for his extraordinary behaviour with regard to the now infamous Eastern Creek letter. Throughout this affair the Premier has failed to provide leadership; he has failed to provide anything smacking of leadership. He had to be dragged kicking and screaming under threat of a censure motion to do what the Opposition has called for from day one - set up an inquiry into this whole affair.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for North Shore to order. I call the member for Ermington to order.

Mr CARR: For a month he has been hiding behind the Ombudsman's inquiry into police conduct. He bumbled through every parliamentary question time insisting that the Ombudsman's inquiry would resolve everything. Now the Ombudsman's inquiry can no longer be held up as an excuse. Under the threat of censure - and only under the

threat of censure - he has conceded what the Opposition has called for from day one. He knew full well that an Ombudsman's inquiry would be severely restricted.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Monaro to order.

Mr CARR: These matters can now be examined by a parliamentary inquiry. That inquiry can investigate the huge principle of police accountability, which underlies this whole affair. This is the inquiry we have been calling for over the past four weeks. We have been vindicated and the Premier has been humbled.

Mr HATTON (South Coast) [2.40]: When the perception in the community is that there has been severe tension between a Minister for Police and a Commissioner of Police, the Minister resigns and the commissioner stays, the level of public concern is extremely great. The matter could not and must not rest there. No Ombudsman can inquire into such a matter to the satisfaction of the people of New South Wales, who realise that the Minister represents the highest level of public accountability for the department he administers. I have had a long history of interest in the New South Wales police force. When I and others, such as John Dowd and Derek Freeman - a former member of the upper House - spoke about systemic corruption in the New South Wales police force we were often greeted with severe criticism and derision. In fact it has been revealed over the years that there was systemic corruption in the New South Wales police force. It had reached into the judiciary and touched such people as former Judge Foord and former Chief Stipendiary Magistrate Farquhar; it had reached into the Parliament through the former Minister for Corrective Services, Mr Jackson; and it had reached into

Page 6850

the public service on a number of occasions. I recall clearly at the height of the Wran days when the punches were flying thick and fast in this Chamber, when Commissioner Wood said on the Caroline Jones program, "Organised crime? I don't think I have ever heard of organised crime, Miss Jones, in the New South Wales police force". It is now accepted that it is naive to assume that all corrupt elements have been removed from any police force anywhere in the world, because the money trees of drugs, illegal gambling and other regulatory areas remain.

I should make it clear that I do not mention corruption in terms of this inquiry. The only relevance corruption has to this parliamentary inquiry is whether the mechanisms of independent audit and accountability of the New South Wales police force are adequate. Is the police force doing its job? Is the Inspector General doing his job? Is the Ombudsman doing his job? If they are not, why are they not, and what can we do to improve the mechanisms of accountability? It is important that there be a bipartisan approach. As the Leader of the Opposition said when the Independent members met with him, he and caucus recognise that at some time in the future there will be a Labor Minister for Police and they may have to come to grips with a similar problem. Therefore it is important that we rise above political point-scoring, that members from both sides of the House take this unique opportunity - because of the public perception, the climate, the importance of the resignation of the Minister for Police in such circumstances and his transfer to another portfolio - to look at the mechanisms of accountability. This is not a get Ted Pickering exercise. It is not a petty party-political point-scoring exercise. This is a research program into what is wrong with lines of communication and mechanisms of accountability that can allow things to get to the stage where a Minister resigns and the Commissioner of Police stays firmly in his place. In acknowledging that this is a bipartisan approach let us also recognise the bipartisan input into this accountability process.

I pay tribute to a former Minister for Police, Mr Anderson. He recognised that

if one builds large structures such as the criminal investigation branch and does not decentralise power, one is building big pyramids that get terribly dark inside and in relation to which one does not know what is happening. The former Minister realised that decentralisation of power and precinct, area responsibility and regional responsibility is the way to go, as is promotion on merit, the establishment of a police college for proper training, hand-in-hand with an education program within the police force to educate police that they are of the community and must work with the community, that they rise out of the community and do not have the them-and-us siege mentality: the community versus them. To achieve that we must get police out of cars and on to the beat, get them involved with community organisations and community policing, and get support from the community because people trust and respect police who are recognised as part of the community. I pay tribute to the vast majority of personnel in the New South Wales police force for carrying out those functions. I know I have received genuine criticism from the rank-and-file of the police force when I have raised matters of corruption. Many of them feel that their wives and families are being reflected upon and that they do not deserve it. It is true that they do not deserve that treatment. Nevertheless, we have a responsibility to expose what is wrong. They have a real investment in this debate - not just the public but ordinary members of the police force.

We must establish proper mechanisms of accountability, which send a signal clearly that there is a bipartisan and strong approach, which says to every police officer at all levels: you are not a force unto yourselves; the Parliament has given you extraordinary powers, as it has given to the Ombudsman and to ICAC. Incidentally, ICAC and the Ombudsman have parliamentary committees which supervise their

Page 6851

activities. The police do not have that type of supervision. In giving those extraordinary powers there must be proper mechanisms of accountability so that we know that those powers are being used properly for community purposes and no other purpose. The former Minister for Police, Mr Anderson, did a good job. Ted Pickering followed it up, and for that I pay tribute to him. I would disagree with Ted Pickering on a lot of matters, but he did follow it up. To put it in my plain, ordinary, everyday language, he took on the police force in some areas. I assure honourable members that it takes courage to do that. A Minister for Police can either do what they want him to do and be a good fellow, and know that things will go smoothly for him, or he will identify problems that exist, as they always will do - whether one is dealing with the police, the Water Board or any other department - and he will do something about them.

If one takes on elements within the police force that have empires to protect and do not believe in public accountability, one does so at considerable risk: either at some stage there will be a counterattack on one's reputation and administration, or one will carry the can for the Gundys of this world, and when things go well one may not necessarily get the accolades that are due. Every Minister for Police and anyone who knows anything about the police force knows the reality of what I have said. The fact that we did have a Commissioner of Police who was in fear of his life, John Avery, is adequate proof of what I say. When someone as dedicated, strong and courageous as John Avery is determined to clean up systemic corruption in the police force and is running risks, that makes a big statement. That is why I have been and am so passionate about this parliamentary inquiry. It cannot be put aside. On a bipartisan basis we must resist the temptation to have a witchhunt, whether aimed at the police, the Minister or the Police Board. We must put aside that temptation and consider what is best for the public of New South Wales, what are the mechanisms of accountability, and the fact that this is yet another organisation that has considerable powers given to it by an Act of Parliament and, therefore, it must have proper reporting, communications and mechanisms of accountability.

I support the Premier who yesterday was impressed with the arguments we put forward. I put those arguments strongly, though I cannot and will not speak for my fellow Independents. A parliamentary committee is a forum that should give all people a fair go. Parliament has the power to establish committees and should use its power. Documents and witnesses can be subpoenaed and, if necessary, witnesses can be compelled to answer. That power should be used to get to the truth. Former and serving police, academics and other people should be encouraged to give evidence. We must endeavour to elicit the truth. The committee should establish whether the Police Board has been doing its job or whether it is a moribund organisation that rubber stamps recommendations for promotion. It is the responsibility of Parliament to inquire into whether the Inspector General is doing the job that he was brought to this country to do for which he is paid a large salary.

I confirm the Premier's statement that I will have no part in a get Ted Pickering or get anyone exercise. I am looking at mechanisms. In the past I have had sharp clashes with Ministers and key figures in the bureaucracy, and there have been casualties - some might be of the view that on occasions I am one of those. However, my underlying aim has always been to put personalities aside; there may be wreckage on the way through but let us get to the mechanisms and establish what does and does not work and then do something about the matter. The Opposition proposed a special commission of inquiry. I said it was the wrong model and that I would not countenance any inquiry set up under the Special Commissions of Inquiry Act. As honourable members are aware, the Act was set up specifically when the Wran Government was

Page 6852

under siege because of serious allegations of corruptions. Former Premier Wran stated in his second reading speech that it would enable him to examine statements made by the Hon. Ian Sinclair, a Federal member of Parliament, and Bob Bottom in New South Wales. There is no doubt it was a get the whistleblower exercise: "We will call you before a special commission and you will have to justify yourself", not "What you are saying is alarming and there may be some truth in it. We will explore that issue and try and find out what is really going on". The special commission of inquiry was going to nail those two men to a cross.

I ask the Government earnestly to consider repealing that legislation because it was and is the wrong model. I understand that in order for the Labor Party to set up an inquiry - which is what it sought to do - under the standing orders it had to choose an existing Act of Parliament as a means of having it listed on private members' day. It requires an Act of Parliament to compel the Attorney General to establish such an inquiry, but the special commissions of inquiry legislation is the wrong model. Yesterday in a press release I stated clearly that under that model a witness could be compelled to give evidence, even though that evidence might incriminate him. Its saving grace is that the evidence could not be used in subsequent court matters. It is clear that the Premier did not rule out an inquiry, perhaps upon completion of the Ombudsman's report. Yesterday I said quite firmly - and I do not mean this in a pejorative sense - that since I have taken an interest in the New South Wales Police Service every Premier and every Minister has said that it is always a good time to set up an inquiry but that time is not now. There is always a good reason why we have to wait.

The Premier has good and proper reasons for wanting to wait, and I do not question his motives, but this matter cannot and must not wait. Because the Ombudsman could not look at the ministerial and political questions four possibilities exist: a royal commission, a judicial inquiry, a commission of inquiry or a parliamentary committee. I have already dealt with the commission of inquiry. To conduct a royal commission or a

judicial inquiry is an extraordinarily expensive exercise. I have been put through the wringer by counsel on behalf of the Australian Federal Police and the New South Wales Police Service, their objective being to destroy me because they did not like what I was saying. I do not want Ted Pickering or any of my colleagues to appear at a judicial inquiry in front of a judicial structure and be torn to ribbons by professionals whose only brief it is to protect their clients. That is not what it is all about. That avoids the Parliament's responsibility, which is to look at the administrative structures from the view point of practising politicians and how they service New South Wales. I believe Ted Pickering should and will, as will other people, get a fair go before a Parliamentary committee. That committee will have representatives from both sides of the House. I hope they have risen above political point scoring and will truly address the question before them, that is, the mechanisms of accountability that justify the powers of the New South Wales Police Service and its use of those powers for the benefit of the people of New South Wales.

Mr W. T. J. MURRAY (Barwon - Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works, and Minister for Roads) [2.56]: I support the statements made by the Premier on the setting up of a joint select committee upon police administration. The principles enunciated in the motion are very precise and very direct. The committee will not impinge upon the inquiry being carried out by the Ombudsman. The select committee will not have the power to investigate matters that the Ombudsman or the Independent Commission Against Corruption are currently investigating. The committee will conduct a specific inquiry into the relationship between the former Minister for Police, Mr Pickering, and the Commissioner of Police, the Police Board and the Inspector

Page 6853

General of Police. Part 2(b) of the terms of reference, which declares they shall not duplicate that examination, is a major factor in establishing this inquiry. During the Premier's absence I strongly resisted entering into a dual inquiry. That would have been an absolute disaster because the Ombudsman and the government select committee would have operated along the same lines. Yet the Opposition sought that at the time. At no time did it attempt to dissociate those two inquiries. The motion foreshadowed yesterday is to create a special commission of inquiry. Only one such inquiry has been held and that was an outrageous misuse of the processes of an inquiry. That inquiry was in regard to the Hon. Ian Sinclair and Bob Bottom. The Opposition now seeks to repeat that procedure yet no one would agree that such a process should ever recur. I agree with the comments made by the honourable member for South Coast that the sooner repealing legislation is introduced the better. The mixes would have been disastrous. The committee will be in a responsible position. The members of the committee have experience in the operation of government. The members from this House are balanced between those who have ministerial experience and those who know how ministerial responsibilities lie, the organisations of departments and relationships between Ministers. Through the appointments of the honourable member for Liverpool, the honourable member for Auburn and the honourable member for Vacluse, ministerial officers and departmental heads can put points of view to the inquiry. That is an essential part of the balance of the committee. The appointment of two well-qualified people to the committee - the honourable member for Baulkham Hills, who has a legal background, and the honourable member for Ballina, who has common sense - is essential to its balance.

Stacking an inquiry with a heap of lawyers is the last thing the Government would do. That appears to be the consensus of the House. With due respect to the Opposition, if the special committee of inquiry it sought to set up had been approved a great line of legal people would have queued up for a nip at the pot. No government could afford the enormous cost of such an inquiry and no person could afford to appear before it. The select committee will have a great deal of responsibility in examining the

operations of the New South Wales Police Board, the Inspector General, and the management structure of the Police Service in regard to the relationship between the police and the Minister. I hope it will recommend a system that can be used not only by this Government but also by the Labor Party should it achieve government at any future time. Above all else a process is needed that will continue from government to government regardless of party, so that the people of this State can have confidence in the police force of this State.

Mr ANDERSON (Liverpool) [3.2]: I am delighted to support the motion for the establishment of the committee. I thank the honourable member for South Coast for his kind remarks about my efforts as Minister for Police in the past, comments he has made consistently since the early 1980s. I disagree with him when he says this is not a get exercise. It is most certainly a get exercise: to get to the truth of what happened and what is needed to overcome the problem. The Deputy Premier went on at some length about the notice of motion given yesterday by the Opposition and what was wrong with the sort of inquiry suggested. Yesterday was day 28 of the saga. The Opposition was placed in a position where it had to try to do something to resolve the matter. It was always in the hands of the Government to resolve the matter when the inconsistencies first arose. As the Opposition warned the Government constantly in press conferences, the gallery would have told the Government that this was a repeat of what occurred with Blackburn where the Government had to be dragged screaming to the crunch to finally establish a form of inquiry. As with Blackburn, the push by the Opposition for this inquiry will be justified at the end. I was delighted that standing orders were suspended.
Page 6854

I thought motions for suspension of standing orders had become extinct. The Opposition agreed to the motion. It is to be hoped the Government might occasionally follow the same procedure so that other matters of equal importance might be debated.

The Leader of the Opposition mentioned his concern that the Hon. D. J. Gay in another place might well be appointed chairman of the committee. I hope the Government takes notice of what has been said. A reading of *Hansard* in the Legislative Council will show to the Government the difficult position in which the Hon. D. J. Gay would be placed. Clearly, as a consequence of his statements in the upper House, he will be a witness before the committee. The important issue mentioned at the beginning of the terms of reference is the question of accountability. Accountability and mechanisms are absolutely vital. From time to time people want to make comparisons between particular portfolios. I speak with some authority, and I know that the former Minister for Police, the Hon. Ted Pickering, would agree that there is no similarity between accountability in the police portfolio and any other portfolio. For some time - I notice the honourable member for Ermington agrees - there has been recognition that there are particular difficulties in the relationship between the Commissioner of Police, the Minister, perhaps the board and others. The Opposition has highlighted the problem not of the mechanisms but of what was going on. No one is seriously suggesting now in the light of events once the Angus Rigg matter achieved some public prominence that it was anything other than the catalyst that brought about the end.

Accountability is vital for any law enforcement organisation, whether it is the New South Wales police force or any other. They do not operate in isolation. God help us if they ever do. It is the same in the armed forces or any other organisation with similar powers. The police must be accountable, and they are accountable through the Minister responsible in this place. Equally, until recent times the Minister for Police has always been accountable to this Parliament and to the people of New South Wales. I challenge anyone to read the *Hansard* of the past four years and tell me that is what has been happening. I welcome the opportunity to put in place by statute, or whatever

means, a system that will restore the accountability of the Minister for Police. I welcome the opportunity to review the accountability of the Police Board of New South Wales, which the Opposition established in 1983 against the opposition of the Liberal Party. It was part of the platform of the Liberal Party at that time to destroy it up until the week after the coalition Government came to office in 1988 when it was withdrawn from the platform. The Opposition warned the Government about the Inspector General when the bill was introduced. No member on the treasury benches knows what the Inspector General does. I have an idea of some of the things he does, and they are very important. The relationship has to be worked out.

I turn to the Commission of Police. Time and time again the gallery has told me something was wrong because the Premier and others have put it about that the Commissioner of Police cannot be removed. He can be removed. He is not in a more powerful position than the Minister for Police and has not been so since the 1930s. Section 27 of the Police Service Act 1990 sets out the process for removing the Commissioner of Police. With the exception of specified matters - insanity, bankruptcy and other like matters - the two key reasons for removal of a commissioner of police under the Act are incompetence or misbehaviour. One might well ask why it is if what the Government said Commissioner Lauer did or did not do can be established that those mechanisms were not used to remove him from his office? The Opposition knows, the Government knows and the public know that if section 27 were invoked Commissioner Lauer would be given the chance to open his mouth before both Houses and tell his side of the story that the Government gagged him on. I wait with great
Page 6855

interest the unleashing of the Commissioner of Police so that I can hear his version of the events. It has been an unfair fight up until now. The Opposition will find out the truth. I say without fear of contradiction - and everyone knows I have known Lauer for a long time and I have known Pickering for a fair while - that from the start of this argument the position has been that the stories of the Hon. Ted Pickering and the Commissioner of Police cannot stand together.

If the Commissioner of Police is to be believed, the Hon. E. P. Pickering should not be anywhere in a Cabinet. But, if the Hon. E. P. Pickering is correct, the situation changes completely; not only does it affect the Commissioner of Police but it affects the entire Police Service. Obviously we would all be appalled if there was any truth in the suggestion by the Hon. E. P. Pickering that the police would be out to kill him, to physically kill him. That is abhorrent to all of us. But it should be equally abhorrent if the police of this State, or a section of the police of this State, were to politically destroy any Minister for Police for whatever reason. This is entirely unacceptable. I want it to be clearly understood by my former police colleagues that if they have a beef with the government of the day or the Minister for Police of the day, they should have the guts and the fortitude to do what my colleagues the Hon. Richard Face and Richard Amery did, and what I did, that is, get out of the coppers, run for Parliament and try to change things for the better, but do not go around undermining people.

[Interruption]

It is unbelievable; they are laughing at me.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Eastwood to order.

Mr ANDERSON: Most of them sat in this place for four years and four months and opposed every initiative that I introduced - the Police Board, the discipline package, promotion by merit, civilianisation, community policing, and police on the beat.

They opposed all of those initiatives. Now what have they done? Suddenly they say that they were good initiatives in which they had some involvement and that they were introduced by John Avery. Members opposite should read their history. John Avery was a vital ingredient in the reform of the New South Wales Police Service but it was an initiative of the Wran Government.

[Interruption]

And my colleague says that it was done by me, but I am humble. Reference was made to accountability and the role of the Police Board. Perhaps the Premier in reply might tell me why, in contravention of the commitments given to this Parliament and the provisions of the police senior executive service, the former Minister for Police, in negotiations with Ross Sayers - and I assume the Premier knew - arranged the secret transfer of Chief Superintendent Jeff Jarratt, now Acting Regional Commander South, from the Police Service to the State Rail Authority without any mention of it to the Commissioner of Police but, more importantly, without any mention of it to the Police Board or to the Chairman of the Police Board, who was appointed by this Government. Give the House an answer to that matter. Why did that transfer not happen? It did not happen because the Commissioner of Police stood up to the Hon. E. P. Pickering and would not let it happen.

Mr Griffiths: Who told you that?

Page 6856

Mr ANDERSON: Who told me that? I reckon 20 or 30 police told me that.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Monaro to order for the second time.

Mr ANDERSON: Government members should check the facts.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Burrinjuck to order.

Mr ANDERSON: Finally it was conceded that the Director-General of the Premier's Department had to be called in - not all that long ago, but before this matter arose - to referee. Judge Thorley was also at the meeting. The Director-General had to suggest a system of communication between the Minister for Police and the Commissioner of Police. The result of the meeting was that the Commissioner of Police would talk to the Minister each day. For goodness' sake, the Government's own Act, section 8 of the Police Service Act of 1990, which mirrors section 4 of the old Police Regulation Act of 1899, says:

The Commissioner is, subject to the direction of the Minister, responsible for the management and control of the Police Service.

Subject to the direction of the Minister.

Mr Phillips: On non-operational matters.

Mr ANDERSON: That is what the Government's Act says. It does not say anything about operations. One day I will have the discussion about what it really means. It means the Commissioner is subject to the direction of the Minister - no exceptions.

Mr Phillips: On non-operational matters.

Mr ANDERSON: It does not say that. That is a myth about non-operational matters. There may be conventions, and they may be worthy, but it is no good for the Minister for Health to tell me that the exception is operational matters. The Act - and it is this Government's Act - does not mention operational matters. People have said to me, including journalists: What could Pickering have done? He could have issued written directions under section 8 to the Commissioner to do this or that. If the Commissioner failed to comply with the directions, he would have been in breach of the section, and would have then either been guilty of misbehaviour or incompetence. But we already know the reason that that course was not pursued. There must be some sanity in all of this. The Government could have had this inquiry a couple of weeks ago but it tried to tough it out, as it did with the Blackburn matter. What is the result? Forget the damage to the Government. The real damage has been to the New South Wales Police Service.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Ermington to order for the second time.

Mr ANDERSON: We should have been focusing on more important issues, but this has assumed an importance of its own because the truth is still not out. Now it is that we must go through this mechanism to find out the truth. The Premier might tell us in reply, with his brilliant new arrangement he came up with to save the Hon. E. P. Pickering from going out of the Cabinet, how he can be appointed Minister for
Page 6857

Justice and Minister for Emergency Services, that is, two separate portfolios. I am not complaining about the two portfolios; that is fine. The problem is that under legislation introduced by this Government in 1989 the police are responsible for the co-ordination of action at the scene of all rescues in New South Wales. That is what this Government's law says about the police. The Government has just appointed as Minister for Emergency Services a person who has vowed never to work another day with Mr Lauer. What will happen if the Minister for Emergency Services says, "This is my policy on these sorts of rescues" and the Minister for Police says: "I do not agree with that. That will not work"? What will happen? Will the Government ask them to have a chat in the local milk bar or meet in Ernie McQuillan's gym? The former Labor Government had to establish the emergency services co-ordinating committee because under the coalition structure it was possible to have a person trapped in a car and 42 people trying to get that person out. I could understand that if certain people were in the vehicle.

Mr W. T. J. Murray: It would be bad luck if we were both in it.

Mr ANDERSON: I have been waiting years to say something like that to someone. The final matter I want to mention relates to structures and accountability. The former Government established the Office of the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, known as OMPES. In the first week that the coalition was in government, the Hon. E. P. Pickering abolished it. While in opposition he had criticised it up hill and down dale. He got rid of it. He got rid of the talent that had been accumulated over years. What happened? The week before last, when the Premier announced the establishment of what is effectively OMPES by another name, that is, the ministry, the Hon. E. P. Pickering was asked about the change and said that he thought it was a wonderful idea to restore OMPES. Why? Had OMPES been in place and had there been proper ministerial accountability, I do not believe we would be here today debating this matter. These things should not have happened. The Opposition makes no criticism of the fact that someone in juvenile justice or somewhere in that administration

made an inquiry at the request of his or her Minister about that matter. That is what one would expect and what should have happened with regard to the police portfolio. It probably did happen, and we will soon know the truth about that situation.

Some people might have thought that I would have some difficulties with this motion. I think it is good. Some changes must be introduced. Those we introduced when in office, especially in the 1980s following the Lusher report, were necessary. The Police Service and policing itself have changed since the early 1980s. There is always a need to review, to refine and to update things in order to cope with changes that take place in law enforcement, society, government or whatever. I see this as a unique opportunity but I leave this House with this thought. If we do not come out of this process fairly quickly with an answer as to who told the truth, and whether there was validity in the claims made by the Hon. E. P. Pickering that Tuesday night, this State and its Police Service will continue in this degree of uncertainty that can only be bad for the community of New South Wales. The truth must out. We must find out who was at fault and something must be done to ensure it never happens again.

Dr MACDONALD (Manly) [3.20]: I support this proposal by the Premier. This as a proud moment for the Parliament - unanimous agreement for the establishment of this inquiry. The Angus Rigg affair is a sad chapter. It will be dealt with by the Ombudsman. The terms of reference of the Ombudsman's inquiry are specific and narrow. They relate to the circumstances of what happened at Milton and also to subsequent investigations, but do not look at the systems currently in place. Those systems may have led to the difficulties between the Minister and the Police
Page 6858

Commissioner and that is why the question of whether the Ombudsman's inquiry is in any way duplicating this inquiry is quite irrelevant. I see the Angus Rigg affair as a chapter in a book; that book will now be examined. It would be too easy to do nothing. It would be too easy to change the management structures within the Police Department. It would be too easy to go on with business as usual. It would be too easy, in a sense, to shuffle the deck chairs. All it does and has done in the past few weeks is raise questions. There are no answers but there is great public disquiet. The question that is being asked is: is this a symptom of some underlying disease?

This is the time to act. Nothing consequential to the outcome of the Ombudsman's inquiry should influence the timing of this particular parliamentary committee. The features of this committee are quite clear and it has nothing but merit: it is Government sponsored, which has benefits; it will include members of both Houses, which has merit; it is bipartisan, which sends out clear messages; it has broad powers; it has powers to subpoena, as the honourable member for South Coast mentioned, as well as to call witnesses. The important thing is that it does have the opportunity to bring in those outside the police force, particularly if the police force appears to put up the shutters. Despite some concern that this whole process could be stonewalled, it will not because opportunities will arise for a broad representation from the community. Most importantly this committee is about the paramountcy of Parliament. It is not about getting Ted Pickering; it is not about implicating witnesses or incriminating witnesses, which may have been so had the Parliament allowed a judicial inquiry under the Special Commissions of Inquiry Act.

Many shortcomings have been outlined by previous speakers. The inquiry is not about getting at the witnesses, it is about getting at those who may have wronged, looking at the systems, and getting at the truth. It is not about being a costly exercise of \$5,000 a day for Queen's Counsels. Most important are the benefits which will flow. Those may not be immediately apparent but will become obvious as the committee sits,

as it contemplates matters and as it ultimately produces its findings. It will send a clear message to the police force about the role of the Parliament. Above all it empowers the Parliament, it puts the Parliament in its rightful place - the supreme position. It is also about looking at accountability of bureaucracy, about opening up the system. There is no doubt that police forces, like military forces, would seek to avoid an element of accountability in the sense that they want to be able to act on their own unfettered, but it is important both from the public interest point of view and for the role of Parliament to augment accountability.

This committee will be of benefit to both parties, the Government of the day and the Opposition, which at some stage will be a future government. It will bring possible reforms to those mechanisms of accountability. The police should welcome it. Perhaps 99 per cent of the police are honest and do a good job and surely they would welcome it; perhaps only those who have something to fear will not welcome it. It will also give the former Minister for Police the opportunity to speak out. My final point is that last night the terms of reference for this committee were considered by the Independents who, in conjunction with the Government, have refined those terms of reference after giving them carefully thought. The terms of reference include the mechanisms of accountability and the relationship of various parties including the Minister, the board, the Inspector General and the commissioner. They examine the entire circumstances surrounding the resignation with the proviso that the committee does not act before the Ombudsman reports but shall look at the outcome of the Ombudsman's report. The terms of reference have been carefully considered. I wish the committee wisdom.

Page 6859

Mr FAHEY (Southern Highlands - Premier, and Treasurer) [3.26], in reply: I thank all honourable members who contributed to the debate and am grateful for the support that has been given to the motion put forward by the Government. It is clear that there is some genuine concern in each of the contributions that have been made on behalf of the Government, the Opposition and each of the Independents - the honourable member for South Coast and the honourable member for Manly - who have made it abundantly clear they are interested in getting a result and believe this is the proper mechanism. But I really shudder when I think of the lack of logic demonstrated in the contribution of the Leader of the Opposition. He has made it clear that he believes the only reason the Government is doing this is that the honourable member for South Coast apparently said yesterday that if the Government did not do something the Opposition would move, or he would move, or someone would move that I as Premier would be censured on the matter. I have no concerns about what mechanisms may be used in relation to my performance as Premier or otherwise.

I support this particular matter. It has been abundantly clear to me from the very beginning that there was a genuine concern by the community and there were matters of concern to the Government about that relationship that required something to be done. That something was done very promptly and very properly. Under no circumstances was it because of a proposed censure or otherwise that the Government today has moved this particular motion. It has moved the motion because it believes there is an opportunity, one which was properly demonstrated in a non-political sense by the Independents - certainly not demonstrated in any sense by the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition calls for an inquiry at the drop of a hat. Who could forget last year when a report was tabled in this House by the Auditor-General on the public superannuation body - a report that simply repeated what had been tabled in this House six weeks earlier in the annual report of the State Authorities Superannuation Board in respect of its performance. Out went the Leader of the Opposition to the media and said:

"Let us have a short, sharp royal commission into all of this. Let us have a short, sharp royal commission into the administration of public sector superannuation", to the point of absolute embarrassment to those who served on that board representing the workers of this State, the secretary of the Labor Council and other representatives of various unions. They were highly embarrassed and rotable. Inquiries, inquiries, inquiries - when in doubt call for an inquiry and that is all honourable members have seen.

For several weeks all that Opposition members have been interested in doing is playing grubby politics in regard to this matter. This has been amply demonstrated by those who have contributed to the debate about a special commission of inquiry. We know what they are about. Those of us who have looked at the object of that exercise - the Deputy Premier, the honourable member for South Coast and the honourable member for Manly all spoke about it - recognised that there was nothing to be achieved by a special commission of inquiry. As I said earlier, this Government is about getting results. I do not understand what the honourable member for Liverpool was endeavouring to achieve. It has been suggested that he was attempting a leadership bid, but I understand that is going very well anyhow, so I am not sure whether he needed this issue.

[Interruption]

The Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member for Liverpool should stop their fighting. It is a question of one or the other telling the truth; it is a question of one or the other not being able to remain. It has been demonstrated throughout this whole affair that there has been a breakdown in communications between them.

Page 6860

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order.

Mr FAHEY: This issue is about the facts. Members of the Opposition may wish to read something into those facts. As was admitted by the former Minister for Police, the facts clearly are -

Mr Carr: He was drunk.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order for the second time.

Mr FAHEY: We have just heard another inane remark from the Leader of the Opposition, which is par for the course.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Illawarra to order.

Mr FAHEY: As I said earlier, there was an inability to communicate and a subsequent lack of accountability, which is of grave concern to the Government and to all sensible thinking people in this Parliament. This motion will ensure that proper structures and mechanisms are put in place. It is not a matter of whether members of the Opposition had it right when they were in government. It is abundantly clear to us that many of the systems that were in place when this Government came into office were a long way off the mark. Many of those systems were in the police portfolio. This is a chance for this Government, in a bipartisan way, to deliver to the people of this State something that can be preserved.

Mr Gibson: What about Duncan Gay?

Mr FAHEY: The question asked by the honourable member for Londonderry is, "What about Duncan Gay?" If we were to disqualify those who interjected in any debate in this House, the honourable member for Londonderry and many other Opposition members would never get a guernsey on any committee.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Londonderry to order.

Mr FAHEY: The honourable member for Londonderry has again demonstrated why he would never get a guernsey on any committee. He is incapable of controlling his emotions whenever his name is mentioned. Let us be sensible. Interjections that may or may not be made in the course of debate should not disqualify anyone from contributing, in a sincere and proper way, to any committee.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Ashfield to order.

Mr FAHEY: All honourable members should recognise that and should not play silly little games.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order for the second time.

Mr FAHEY: There is a need for this Parliament to ultimately deliver something of substance. I am confident that that will happen. Contributions made by members of the Opposition clearly demonstrated that they are playing politics. However, there was enough substance in the contributions of the Leader of the Opposition and, in particular,
Page 6861

the honourable member for Liverpool to ensure that the community and the Parliament should have some confidence. The committee's interim report and final report will provide the Government, in a legislative sense and otherwise, with a mechanism to ensure that the Police Service will deliver to the people of this State what it is designed to deliver and what every fair minded person would want it to deliver. I commend the motion.

Motion agreed to.

Message

Message sent to the Legislative Council advising it of the resolution and requesting it to appoint four of its members to serve upon the committee.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

POLICE BOARD APPOINTMENT

Mr CARR: I direct my question without notice to the Premier, and Treasurer.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Before the Leader of the Opposition commences his question I remind all honourable members that, for the duration of question time, all calls to order that have been incurred since 2.15 p.m. will stand.

Mr CARR: Did former Governor Sir James Rowland recently seek reappointment to the Police Board with the full support of the board? Why did the Premier not support his reappointment?

Mr FAHEY: I have no knowledge of whether former Governor Sir James Rowland sought reappointment to the Police Board. Under legislation established by the honourable member for Liverpool some years ago when he was police Minister, a Minister can make appointments to the Police Board. I do not know whether Sir James Rowland sought reappointment. If there was such a request, I do not know whether it was denied. It was certainly not brought to my attention.

AUSTRALIAN DELEGATION TO CHINA

Mr D. L. PAGE: My question without notice is directed to the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works, and Minister for Roads. Will the Minister advise the House of the results of his recent visit to China where he led a business delegation?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Riverstone to order.

Mr D. L. PAGE: Did the visit succeed in opening up joint venture opportunities for the New South Wales Government, the Chinese Government and the New South Wales private sector?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Swansea to order for the second time. I call the honourable member for Blacktown to order.

Mr W. T. J. MURRAY: The honourable member for Ballina has a keen interest in seeking out joint ventures and for the promotion of businesses both in this State and overseas. Last week I led a fairly high level State Government and private sector

Page 6862

delegation to China, visiting the special economic zone of Shenzhen, our sister State of Guangdong, and China's capital city, Beijing. I was accompanied on the delegation by the Minister for Sport, Recreation and Racing - who will be reporting on his visit independently - and by the Hon. Helen Sham-Ho, a member of the Legislative Council. Members of the Department of State Development, including the Director-General, Dr John Saunders, headed the State Government section of the delegation, which included senior executives from the Department of Health, the Department of School Education, the Department of Mineral Resources, the Department of Sport, Recreation and Racing and the Land Information Centre.

The private sector had representatives from enterprises such as Fliway-AFA International, AWA Traffic and Information Services, Utilux Pty Limited, FAI Mining Limited, Elcom Services Pty Limited, Sydney Electricity, Jibsen Trading Pty Limited, British Aerospace-Ansett Flying College, Ground Support Engineering Australia Pty Limited and Zhonghua Capital Pty Limited. The delegation attended the Tenth Economic Committee Conference in Guangzhou, which I jointly opened with the Vice-Governor of Guangdong. The conference reaffirmed the great importance that the New South Wales Government and the People's Government of Guangdong Province place on the sister State relationship. One of the main purposes of the visit was to provide private sector delegates with access to senior political and economic officials in China. Political and economic reforms in China are moving at an impressive rate and, as China's 1.1 billion people move towards a market economy, many businesses and trading opportunities are emerging.

Our sister State relationship with Guangdong is already paying dividends with the commencement of joint ventures between New South Wales companies, arms of the State Government and Guangdong agencies. One of the best examples of such joint ventures is that which exists between the New South Wales Land Information Centre, New South Wales companies and the Guangdong Department of Lands and Development, to form a spatial data processing organisation in Guangzhou. Further joint ventures will see a pilot land information system established in Zhuhai and the establishment in Guangdong of a data capture business involving the New South Wales and Guangdong governments and a number of selected Australian partnerships. In partnership with AWA, the State Government has succeeded in selling the SCATS traffic management system to Guangzhou. An amount of \$14 million will be invested in that project. Guangzhou, like many other major Chinese cities, has major traffic control problems. The SCATS system has been sold to Shanghai. Beijing is interested in the system and the SCATS centre will operate in Shenzhen. The success of SCATS in Guangzhou will create many other opportunities. The current installation in Guangzhou is being carried out at the same time as the \$20 million SCATS system is being installed in Hong Kong. I am confident that with the rapid growth of Guangzhou and the development of many other cities, the demand in China will grow for the SCATS system, which is extremely profitable to the Roads and Traffic Authority.

Mr Whelan: On a point of order. The matters being detailed by the Deputy Premier are vitally important to the State. He has referred to achievements of which we should all be proud. Given the obvious importance of the matters, I ask that rather than take up any more of question time the Deputy Premier should inform the House of the matters by way of ministerial statement at the appropriate time.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is no real substance in the point of order taken by the honourable member for Ashfield. In essence, the Deputy Premier is providing factual information rather than stating policy. Having said that, however, in recent days I have been concerned at the length of some answers. I urge all Ministers to contain their answers to a reasonable length.

Page 6863

Mr W. T. J. MURRAY: My meeting with the Chinese Minister for Commerce, Mr Hu Ping, could open up exciting opportunities for joint ventures in the agricultural industry. The Minister guaranteed that China will remain an important customer for Australian wheat and, especially, barley. With more than 800 breweries in China a malting house is absolutely necessary. The expenditure of \$1 billion in China for grain storage and grain handling will create an opportunity for business enterprises to be involved in that exercise. There is a desperate need for grain maintenance. About 30 per cent of the crop is lost between harvest and consumption. There are tremendous prospects in China. I take this opportunity to point out to the whole community that an opportunity for export exists for this State to the Guangdong province and joint ventures have been entered into as a result of our sister State relationship.

JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr WHELAN: I direct my question without notice to the Minister for Police. When did the Minister become aware that the Office of Justice contacted the Shoalhaven hospital three times concerning Angus Rigg? With whom did the Minister discuss the matter? Has he reported this matter to the Ombudsman? If not, why not?

Mr GRIFFITHS: Because three juveniles were involved in the incident on the South Coast, it was normal for juvenile justice to track them, particularly when two of those juveniles were taken to the Keelong Regional Youth Centre. That occurred the day after the incident. I have not raised that issue with the Ombudsman, nor do I consider it appropriate to do so. It had nothing to do with juvenile justice except that the two young ladies in question were incarcerated at Keelong Regional Youth Centre.

ATHLETES EXCHANGE PROGRAM WITH CHINA

Mr KINROSS: I address my question without notice to the Minister for Sport, Recreation and Racing. Is the Minister, who recently returned from a visit to China to negotiate a sporting exchange for young New South Wales athletes, able to tell the House how that exchange will benefit the development of Australian sport?

Mr Langton: On a point of order. In answer to a previous question the Deputy Premier stated clearly that the Minister for Sport, Recreation and Racing would be reporting to the Parliament separately on matters relating to his visit. Therefore, one can assume that a report will be presented, and it must be done by way of ministerial statement.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! It is obvious that the honourable member for Kogarah has not read any precedents relating to ministerial statements. No point of order is involved.

Mr SCHIPP: The honourable member for Gordon is to be commended for taking an interest in a matter of such importance to New South Wales. I take this opportunity to congratulate him on his excellent maiden speech, which he delivered in this House last night. It was a thought-provoking speech of which some members opposite should read and take notice. I acknowledge the success of the delegation to China which was ably led by the Deputy Premier. I was involved principally with the southern region of the Guangdong Province.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Blacktown to order for the second time. I call the honourable member for Heffron to order. I call the honourable member for Ashfield to order for the second time. I call the honourable member for Port Stephens to order.

Page 6864

Mr SCHIPP: For my part the basis of the visit related to efforts over a number of years to develop an exchange of sporting ties between Guangdong Province, our sister State, and New South Wales. To bring it to fruition there had to be face-to-face talks -

[Interruption]

Opposition members are nerds; they do not want anything for New South Wales.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Liverpool to order.

Mr SCHIPP: An interesting feature of the visit was the way attitudes changed dramatically throughout the visit from those that were expressed on day one.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask all members to maintain some sense of decorum in the Chamber and allow the Minister for Sport, Recreation and Racing to complete his

answer.

Mr SCHIPP: I refer in particular to the private sector involvement. On the first day the private sector was not as optimistic as it was expected to be in relation to some joint ventures that were being developed. By the second day that attitude had changed because of the relationships that had developed as a result of firsthand involvement. The same can be said of discussions involving sporting exchange ties, which have been sought for a number of years.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Blacktown to order for the third time.

Mr SCHIPP: I am pleased to report that as a result of the visit an exchange program has come to fruition, and it will operate to the mutual benefit of athletes in China and in New South Wales.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Cabramatta to order.

Mr SCHIPP: Six young swimmers from the Chinese province will visit Australia to train and compete in the New South Wales age championships in January next year. At the recent Barcelona Olympics China emerged as something of a new power in swimming events. Its athletes will gain much from the experience, as will ours. In return, a team of six young gymnasts from New South Wales will be selected by the New South Wales Gymnastic Association and will travel to Guangdong in August 1993 to train under the expertise of the Chinese coaches and compete against Chinese gymnasts in their own age group. At national and international levels our gymnasts are becoming a force to be reckoned with. The team selected will benefit from the coaching expertise of the internationally acclaimed Chinese. This new exchange program is a further step in the efforts of the Department of Sport, Recreation and Racing to ensure that young and talented athletes have access to international competition.

Athlete exchanges have taken place since 1985 - a fact that members opposite would not know, as they are not much interested in sport, except for the honourable member for Charlestown who does have an understanding of the value of these efforts. The Chinese exchange will be the fourth that has been negotiated. Already established are exchanges with Japan in the field of athletics, Germany in swimming, and Austria in skiing. Those initiatives have attracted government funding of about \$250,000 since 1989-90, and a further \$160,000 has been budgeted for the 1992-93 financial year. The
Page 6865

program specifically targets talented young junior athletes. Several participants have gone on to compete regularly at an international level. Honourable members will appreciate the value of exchange programs with other countries, particularly having regard to their cultural and, in this instance, sporting significance, as well as the fact that Australia's geographic location makes it difficult to expose our athletes to international competition. Following this breakthrough with the Chinese exchange program it is predicted confidently that Chinese sporting officials will move to having further exchanges in diving, weightlifting, table tennis, badminton and women's rowing. I have no doubt that these arrangements will assist our young athletes to improve in the future and that they will come to the fore. The outcome will provide invaluable opportunities for our athletes and will further strengthen the excellent sister city relationship we enjoy with the Chinese.

GIO PRIVATISATION

Mr KNIGHT: My question without notice is addressed to the Minister for Finance, Assistant Treasurer, and Minister for Ethnic Affairs. Does the Minister still stand by the assurance he gave on the "7.30 Report" program of 17th September that the Australian Securities Commission gave the due diligence provisions of the GIO float a clear bill of health?

Mr SOURIS: I was advised by the solicitors for the Government, Allen Allen and Hemsley, that a due diligence audit was carried out by the Australian Securities Commission, predominantly at the offices of Allen Allen & Hemsley, and that the audit of the due diligence process was clear.

Later,

I wish to correct an answer I gave earlier on this matter. Earlier I advised the House that the due diligence audit was conducted at the offices of Allen Allen and Hemsley. I have been advised by the Government solicitors, Allen Allen and Hemsley, that the audit was conducted in the offices of Blake Dawson Waldron, solicitors for the GIO. It commenced at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, 2nd September, and concluded on Thursday, 3rd September, at about 4 p.m. The Australian Securities Commission officers were provided with a copy of the due diligence report, the primary supporting material for each chapter of the report, and the detailed material in respect of Chapter 8 (Forecasts). They were also shown the complete library of due diligence material, and advised that access to any document in the collection could be made available on request. At the request of the ASC officers, copies of certain documents were provided. At the conclusion of the inspection the ASC officers indicated that they were satisfied with what they had seen, and that they did not consider that any further inquiry in respect of the due diligence material would be necessary. The due diligence material was described as comprehensive. It is understood that the ASC is intending to review the 30th June audited financial results when available.

SYDNEY OLYMPIC GAMES BID

Mr SMILES: I ask the Minister for Transport, and Minister for Tourism whether any surveys have been conducted to gauge public support for Sydney's Olympic bid. Will the Minister inform the House of the results of any such survey?

Mr BAIRD: I thank the honourable member for North Shore for his interest in Sydney's Olympic bid for the year 2000. The commitment of the city to the bid is an important criterion in assessing the likelihood of being given the honour of hosting the

Page 6866

games in the year 2000. We know that public support has been growing and is part of the formal response that must be provided in the bid book documents. They will be available in March next year. As part of the formal process of siting the various venues for the games a level of community support must be communicated. Surveys of that support must be objective. It is significant to note that some of the other cities bidding for the games have not gained widespread community support. For example, Berlin has 60 per cent opposition to the games. It is important that Sydney has a widespread level of support. To provide the bid book documents with an indication of the level of support in Sydney a survey was conducted by the Ramis Corporation of 1,000 people in New South Wales. They included 400 people in Sydney, 400 people living near the main Olympic zones and 200 people living in country areas. It is fair to say that the results exceeded all expectations. About 90 per cent of those polled said they supported Sydney's bid for the year 2000 Olympic Games.

Those results will leave the International Olympic Committee members in no doubt that the people of New South Wales, and Sydney particularly, desperately want the games to be held in this State in the year 2000, because of all the benefits they know the games will bring with them. The importance of achieving such a high level of community support cannot be underestimated. As the second official visit from the IOC will start this weekend, it is important for that great level of support to be registered. The results of the research will be included in the bid books. Today the great British miler, Steve Cram, arrived in Australia. He won last year's Diet Coke Mile. When asked where he thought the year 2000 games should be held he said his preference was not Manchester but Sydney. There is widespread community support in country areas, in the city and around the sites of the Olympic facilities. That demonstrates that Sydney does have a strong chance of gaining the Olympic Games in the year 2000.

PROPOSED RADIOACTIVE WASTE DUMP

Mr BECKROGE: My question without notice is directed to the Premier, and Treasurer. Does the Government support the siting of a radioactive waste dump within western New South Wales? If not, what action does the Premier intend taking to prevent the project from going ahead?

Mr FAHEY: My understanding about the siting of a radioactive or other type of waste dump in western New South Wales is that an independent committee has been examining the proposal. The Government will take on board any recommendation - and to this time there has not been any - and consider it. At this stage all honourable members should examine carefully the green paper on the question of waste disposal that has been released by the Minister for the Environment. We must come to grips with the problems of waste, whatever form it takes, and make sensible decisions in respect of it. We cannot continue to run around in circles indefinitely and to bury our heads in the sand on such an issue. Clearly communities have demonstrated on numerous occasions that they are opposed to landfill as a means of disposal of waste. It is clear also that there is little room left for landfill sites for the type of rubbish that is appropriate for those sites. Therefore it is incumbent upon us to examine the green paper, as I am sure the committee established by the Parliament yesterday will do, and bring forward constructive suggestions in the interests of the community.

Speculation about a site in the west of the State was started when the former member for Fairfield, who was then Minister for Local Government, Mrs Crosio, made the suggestion that a site about 30 kilometres from Broken Hill be considered as the site for disposal of toxic waste. At that stage - about seven years ago - the suggestion caused

Page 6867
concern. I learned about that concern not in this Parliament but when I accompanied a number of members of the National Party, including the Minister for Agriculture and Rural Affairs, to the west of the State. The residents of Broken Hill expressed to me their great concern as to why that region should be the dumping ground for toxic waste in this country. I do not know where the site should be. The New South Wales Government has not considered that matter. I do know that it is incumbent upon us to come to grips with some of these problems. For many years we have been going around in circles. It would be remiss of any member of this House to simply continue ignoring the problem and cause greater problems for our children. I am sure the Minister for the Environment will bring forward a sensible recommendation and a constructive paper for consideration by Cabinet. At the appropriate time, when Cabinet has considered any recommendation, the appropriate announcement will be made.

PROPOSED RADIOACTIVE WASTE DUMP

Mr BECKROGE: I ask a supplementary question of the Premier, and Treasurer. Am I to take it from the Premier's reply that he was referring to radioactive waste?

Mr FAHEY: I understood the question by the honourable member for Broken Hill to refer to a site near Broken Hill for radioactive waste and that was the reason for my answering the question in the way I did.

UNLICENSED CAR DEALERS

Mr SMITH: I address my question without notice to the Minister for Consumer Affairs, and Assistant Minister for Education. Has the Department of Consumer Affairs investigated the trade in backyard car dealing by people without appropriate licences? If so, what action is being taken on the problems caused by this trade?

Mrs CHIKAROVSKI: I thank the honourable member for his continuing support. He is the chairman of the consumer affairs backbench committee. I am well aware of the existence of unlicensed motor dealers and the problems they are causing to consumers of this State. I assure the House that the investigation of such conduct is a high priority for the department. In recent years the number of unlicensed dealers who have been prosecuted has increased, not because of an increase in unlicensed dealers but because of the outstanding improvement in the department's method of investigation. For example, in the past two months the department has overhauled its computer system which monitors advertisements in newspapers for the sale of motor vehicles. As a result, investigators can now check more quickly those dealers who are advertising more frequently but who are not licensed to do so. This will result in investigations proceeding more quickly, and prosecutions will follow where necessary. Operators who are convicted face substantial fines and will be ordered to forfeit the proceeds of their illegal activity. Last year 22 persons were prosecuted and the fines and forfeiture totalled \$109,101. So far this year a further 23 persons have been prosecuted and since July seven operators have been found guilty. I am advised by the department that a further eight cases are to come before the courts.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Smithfield to order. I call the Minister for the Environment to order for the second time.

Mrs CHIKAROVSKI: The honourable member for Smithfield might like to pay attention to what I am saying. If the information is boring to the honourable member, that is his problem, not mine. I advise the consumers of this State that one of

Page 6868

the concerns is that odometer tampering is prevalent among backyarders, as they are known. Odometer tampering occurs throughout the car industry but is far more prevalent with backyarders. I warn consumers buying a car privately to take care about advertisements that claim, "only one owner" and "low kilometres". Though this practice is most common among backyard dealers, mainstream companies have been involved. A recent case was that of a hire car franchisee who was found guilty of winding back the odometers of 12 vehicles. In June Tymbabe Pty Limited and its managing director, Christopher Bailey, were each fined \$12,000 plus costs.

[Interruption]

This concerns people who buy cars and then find out they are not getting what they believe they paid for. I am surprised that honourable members opposite also are not concerned about this matter. I urge consumers wishing to buy secondhand motor vehicles to minimise their risk. I remind the public and honourable members about the work of the register of encumbered vehicles, commonly known as REVS. This service is available free of charge to the public. It advises a member of the public who telephones whether money is owing on a vehicle or whether the vehicle has been reported stolen. Any person considering buying a car privately would be foolish not to check with REVS. I inform the House that in the past 12 months more than 520,000 inquiries - an average of 10,000 a week - were received by REVS. I assure the House that the Department of Consumer Affairs will continue to ensure that consumers in New South Wales are well protected in their dealings with the motor industry generally, and particularly in relation to backyarders.

MILK PACKAGING

Mr JEFFERY: My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Agriculture and Rural Affairs. What effect have recent packaging initiatives by milk processors had on the marketing of milk in New South Wales?

Mr ARMSTRONG: All sectors that participate in milk production, processing and distribution are continually assessing the product's quality and availability. They are also seeking new ways to improve the product and its supply to best meet the needs of consumers in New South Wales. More specifically, recent developments in the packaging of milk will cater better for New South Wales consumers. I am pleased to announce that on 19th October a new 1.5-litre carton will be officially introduced to the Sydney market. This container is designed to cater for those people for whom one litre is not enough but two litres is too much. Research undertaken prior to the introduction of the new container revealed that both the public and milk vendors are receptive to its introduction. The 1.5-litre package is a world first and is designed and produced in Australia by an Australian-owned company. Much of the other cardboard packaging used for similar food products in Australia is designed off-shore, whence the profits are repatriated. This significant breakthrough in liquid containers will help to keep some of the profits of this valuable packaging in Australia. Also, the packaging is regarded as environmentally friendly, and the likelihood of wastage of milk is considerably reduced. That, of course, saves energy in production and is efficient for the milk processor.

Sydney's first permanent recycling service for milk cartons began in April. Cartons are collected outside Food Plus stores in the metropolitan area and recycled by the Nowra plant of Associated Pulp and Paper Mills to produce office paper. Though it may appear that the glass milk bottle is being replaced by other forms of packaging, this is not the case. In recent weeks honourable members would be aware of considerable

Page 6869

speculation in the press and debate on the future of glass milk bottles. The decrease in the amount of milk available in glass reflects the decline in public demand for bottled milk. This decline in demand is also affecting pasteurised milk, so much so that the production of non-homogenised pasteurised milk ceased on 1st October. Homogenised milk in glass bottles will continue to be available to those people who were purchasing pasteurised milk packaged in glass.

Other initiatives in the dairy industry relate to the milk itself rather than its packaging. In particular, the industry has been aware of the health needs of the people of New South Wales, and the recent introduction of Farmers Best milk has made a significant contribution. Farmers Best, from Australian Co-operative Foods, is a new

product containing reduced fat, with monounsaturated vegetable fats replacing the original animal fat. This process makes a reduced fat product with the full cream taste of regular milk. A world first, this Farmers Best product was designed to meet the increasing consumer demand for low fat milk. Already more than \$80 million worth of production licence sales for production of this product have been made in other States and overseas. This type of product development not only meets consumer needs but also caters for the health requirements of New South Wales and carries the National Heart Foundation's red tick of approval.

In recent years a number of low fat milks such as Shape and Lite White have been developed. I must thank my colleague the honourable member for Oxley for launching Lite White at Taronga Zoo. Low fat milks enjoy considerable and continued increases in sales, thereby meeting the changing nutritional expectations of the buying public. Even more positive things are occurring in the milk market with the relaunch on Monday of Moove flavoured milk. A new flavour range, including a summer peach flavour, was launched, along with a new packaging style. Again, considerable research has been undertaken. This has given New South Wales an edge in this type of presentation. It is important to encourage younger people to develop the habit of choosing a healthy convenience beverage for consumption. Flavoured milks are a rich source of calcium, which is vital in the prevention of osteoporosis in later life.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Baulkham Hills to order.

Mr ARMSTRONG: The national dietary survey of schoolchildren found that many of our children were consuming less than the recommended dietary intake of calcium. Already one in four post-menopausal women and one in six men in their seventies suffer from osteoporosis. This figure is likely to burgeon dramatically if children and young adults do not increase their calcium intake. An improvement in diet at a young age in future will help alleviate health cost burdens on the community.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Moorebank to order.

Mr ARMSTRONG: All in all many initiatives are being undertaken in the dairy industry in relation to milk, modified milks and improved packaging, which certainly are in the very best interests not only of the dairy industry but also of the people of New South Wales. It is pertinent to point out that this afternoon the shadow minister for police was grandstanding. He has now assumed leadership by sitting in the leader's position. It did not take him long to make the transfer. Another Opposition leader has fallen and the heir apparent has taken his seat.

Page 6870

HOMEFUND REVIEW

Mrs GRUSOVIN: My question without notice is addressed to the Minister for Consumer Affairs, and Assistant Minister for Education. What action has the Minister taken under the State's Fair Trading Act in relation to the HomeFund program since becoming Minister? Why has she not stopped all promotion of HomeFund until the Trade Practices Commission inquiry, the McMurtrie review and cases currently before the Consumer Claims Tribunal have been concluded? Will the Minister issue a public warning statement about HomeFund?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Illawarra to order for the second time. I call the honourable member for Sutherland to order. I call the honourable member for Smithfield to order for the second time.

Mrs CHIKAROVSKI: As the honourable member for Heffron is well aware, my colleague the Minister for Planning, and the Minister for Housing in another place is responsible for the administration of the HomeFund program. The Minister has established an inquiry into HomeFund which is chaired by Mr John McMurtrie, to which the honourable member for Heffron has just referred. As part of its functions under the Credit Home Finance Contracts Act the Department of Consumer Affairs negotiated with credit providers where, for various reasons, a borrower could not meet home mortgage commitments. In appropriate cases commitments were restructured to overcome temporary setbacks so that families could remain in their homes. Honourable members will be aware that the Trade Practices Commission is looking into the scheme's contractual arrangements with borrowers as well as aspects of its advertising. It is understood these issues are being considered by Mr McMurtrie's inquiry. In the circumstances, it would not be appropriate for the Department of Consumer Affairs to duplicate inquiries that are already well advanced.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Heffron to order for the second time. She has asked the question; she will listen to the answer.

Mrs CHIKAROVSKI: At the moment the Consumer Claims Tribunal is dealing with nine matters involving HomeFund. The matters are sub judice and it is therefore inappropriate for me to comment further.

WOMEN IN THE HOTEL AND TOURISM INDUSTRY

Mr SCHULTZ: My question without notice is directed to the Chief Secretary, and Minister for Administrative Services. What progress has been made in the program launched recently to encourage women to take a greater role in the hotel industry, particularly in country areas?

Mrs COHEN: I thank the honourable member for Burrinjuck for his question.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members appear to be in a good mood and the House in a benign state. Nevertheless, the level of interjection makes it difficult for me to hear answers properly. I ask members to co-operate until the end of question time.

Mrs COHEN: As honourable members would be aware, women perform an important role in the hotel industry of New South Wales, which comprises approximately 2,000 hotels. They have performed that role throughout the history of the New South Wales liquor industry, but the role has been largely unrecognised. The profile of women
Page 6871

in hotels should be recognised in its own right, not just in terms of the roles that are supportive of men or in the behind-the-scenes roles traditionally given to women. The role of women in the hotel industry is the subject of an innovative project being carried on by the Australian Hotels Association. The New South Wales branch is in charge of the project. The women in the hotel industry project commenced with the benefit of a grant from the Chief Secretary's Department and the New South Wales Government. The project is a first for the New South Wales hospitality industry and follows for the first time in the more than 100 years of the Australian Hotels Association's existence the appointment of two women to its executive. The two women executives - Sandra Spooner and Dorris Bishop - have already demonstrated their vision and energy in

developing the women in industry project to this stage. Having met both women, I am sure they bring a breath of change to the activities of that association.

The Government's grant to the AHA will fund a range of activities as a part of the project during 1992-93. The project has commenced and is making excellent progress. The AHA has established a women in industry subcommittee to oversee the project, and the project co-ordinator research assistant has commenced work on a part-time basis. The preliminary results of a questionnaire sent out to all female hoteliers earlier this year have already been compiled. Over one-third of the 352 female licensees in New South Wales responded, with 82 per cent of those responses coming from the rural areas. It is interesting that almost 70 per cent of the respondents cited the main problems facing women in the industry as a lack of acceptance by the industry and a lack of credibility within the industry. This is despite the fact that 95 per cent of the women surveyed said that they actively participate both in management and in the day-to-day tasks of running a hotel. The high response from rural women hoteliers has suggested the low status of women in hotels is much more prevalent in country rather than city areas.

As part of the project a series of workshops has been scheduled in city and country areas of the State to be run in conjunction with regional meetings of the Australian Hotels Association. The first workshop was held in August at Byron Bay on the North Coast. I am advised that the workshop was most successful and confirmed that women in the area would welcome greater female participation at an executive level in both branch and State levels of the association's activities. The project aims to involve country women as a special priority. This is in recognition of the isolation and hardship country women often experience and the attitudes they often have to deal with. The North Coast meeting identified some particular problems women in the hotel industry encounter. These included not having the opportunity to attend courses or meetings or being able to avail themselves of the many educational programs they need to gain equal footing with the executives in their association and the management scale in their hotels. The North Coast women also felt that to be successful and confident in participation in courses and meetings they need extra skills to contribute to meetings and presentation and personal marketing skills. A significant outcome of the North Coast meeting is that a communication network has been established for the women in that area. That network will be providing an ongoing source of support.

There are approximately 350 female licensees in this State and an immense number of women are employed in the industry. I am pleased that this project will enable these women to have a greater role in their industry and to make a contribution to the planning of future directions. Women bring very important skills to the hotel industry and play a vital part in fostering a positive hospitality image. The project will encourage these positive advantages that women express, and they will be particularly beneficial to the many women who need work in the hotel industry in the rural areas of

Page 6872

New South Wales. This project provides a positive model for enhancing the role of women in other sectors of the hospitality and tourism industries. I will be watching the progress of the project closely to see what potential it has to increase the participation of women in the tourism and hospitality industries in the State of New South Wales. New South Wales is expecting an increase in the rapidly developing tourism industry, particularly in country areas. New South Wales has an untapped resource in its exceptional traditional early Australian country hotels. If women can be trained to succeed in the management areas of the hotel industry, there will be great experience in the renovation and marketing of the traditional early Australian hotels. This would provide a great resource for a tourist package in our State. I congratulate the women

involved in this project and wish them well. I think the project will lead to greater development of women in the hotel and tourism industry generally.

METROPOLITAN AIR QUALITY STRATEGY

Dr KERNOHAN: I address my question without notice to the Minister for the Environment. What progress is being made towards establishing the metropolitan air quality strategy? When will detailed information about western Sydney's air quality be available?

Mr HARTCHER: I thank the honourable member for Camden for her question and for her excellent sense of timing. She takes a great interest in the welfare of her electorate, especially matters relating to the environment, and takes great care to follow up all questions relating to air and water pollution in her region. I congratulate her on that and commend her for her continuing interest. The metropolitan air quality strategy that the Government is pursuing is a direct result of the air quality summits convened in July last year by the former Premier and by the former Minister for the Environment. It is unfortunate that it took until the 1990s for action to be taken but, given the abysmal environmental record of the previous Government, that was to be expected. Following the summit the former Minister for the Environment gave a commitment to establish air monitoring networks in Sydney, Newcastle and Wollongong, and it is my pleasure to follow through on that commitment. Within 12 months of the first summit a new air monitoring station was opened at Richmond. Last month, in conjunction with the honourable member for Camden and the Chief Secretary, and Minister for Administrative Services, I opened another new monitor at Bringelly and inspected progress on the St Marys monitor. The Airtrack mobile monitoring unit will operate at St Marys until the permanent facility is commissioned, which will take place soon.

The honourable member for Blacktown will be pleased to know that the Blacktown monitor will be commissioned within the next few weeks, fulfilling a promise made to the people of western Sydney by this Government. It will deliver a vital environmental yardstick to the people of the west that the honourable member and her party were unable to produce in 12 years in office. The former Government ignored the issue. If the honourable member for Blacktown paid more attention to her electorate, she might be able to achieve something for it rather than being rolled constantly in the shadow cabinet on environmental issues, such as occurred yesterday with respect to Khappinghat. That issue has led the environmental movement to say that the Australian Labor Party is down to its last shreds of environmental credibility. It is a party now seen, according to the Director of the Total Environment Centre, to have gone back on its commitments to the environmental movement. It goes to show that so far as the environment is concerned the Australian Labor Party has pursued and continues to pursue a purely cynical role.

Page 6873

The Government will install two new monitors in the Hunter region, one in Newcastle City and the other at Wallsend. Approval has been given by Wollongong City Council for a new monitor to be installed in the Illawarra later this year. The mobile station at St Marys will be moved next month to the Riverstone-Kellyville area to help select the site for a permanent station in that location. The upgrading of existing stations is also proceeding rapidly. Stations at Rozelle and Westmead have already been upgraded, and work is proceeding on the station at Liverpool. In answer to the second part of the honourable member's question, information about air quality in western

Sydney is already available and will become more detailed and accurate over the next few weeks. Contrary to the scare tactics adopted by the Opposition, the scientific data gathered through the Richmond station - within your electorate, Mr Speaker - has revealed that since May air pollution levels have been consistently low. In fact, they have been lower than overall Sydney levels. Early results from the Bringelly station have also been consistently low. However, the pattern of wind movements, particularly in summer, tends to transport pollutants produced elsewhere into the Hawkesbury Valley. I will keep the House informed of the results from all air monitoring stations during the summer season.

Merely to monitor air quality is not enough, and this Government is committed to addressing a wide range of air quality issues. In conjunction with the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works, and Minister for Roads I recently announced the second stage of the pilot vehicle emission tests. This project is particularly important for western Sydney as ozone, formed in a slow reaction between two pollutants produced mainly by vehicle emissions, is the major air pollution encountered in western Sydney. The metropolitan air quality study will involve the undertaking of four major scientific consultancies. This will develop an emissions inventory and will enhance the understanding of meteorology and air chemistry in the Newcastle, Sydney and Wollongong areas. A detailed set of airshed models will be developed and used to evaluate planning and control options available to address air quality issues in these areas. The process to let these consultancies is already well advanced, with the successful tenderers to be selected later this year. I can assure the honourable member for Camden and all Government members, who appear to be the only ones interested in this vital issue of air quality in the west, that the Government will continue to pursue an active role in ensuring that the people of western Sydney have effective information about air quality. The Government will continue to undertake all necessary measures that are appropriate for the State Government to undertake to ensure that the air in western Sydney is properly monitored and protected.

JOINT ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

Messages

Mr Speaker reported the receipt of the following messages from the Legislative Council:

Mr Speaker

The Legislative Council desires to inform the Legislative Assembly that it has this day agreed to the following resolution:

(1) Upon the receipt of a Message from the Legislative Assembly, the House shall appoint twenty five Estimates Committees to be known as:

Page 6874

- (a) The Legislature Estimates Committee;
- (b) Premier and Treasurer Estimates Committee;
- (c) Aboriginal Affairs Estimates Committee;

- (d) Agriculture and Rural Affairs Estimates Committee;
- (e) Arts Estimates Committee;
- (f) Attorney-General Estimates Committee;
- (g) Conservation and Land Management and Energy Estimates Committee;
- (h) Chief Secretary and Administrative Services Estimates Committee;
- (i) Community Services Estimates Committee;
- (j) Consumer Affairs Estimates Committee;
- (k) Education and Training Estimates Committee;
- (l) Environment Estimates Committee;
- (m) Ethnic Affairs Estimates Committee;
- (n) Health Estimates Committee;
- (o) Industrial Relations and Employment and Training Estimates Committee;
- (p) Justice and Emergency Services Estimates Committee;
- (q) Local Government and Co-operatives Estimates Committee;
- (r) Natural Resources Estimates Committee;
- (s) Planning and Housing Estimates Committee;
- (t) Police Estimates Committee;
- (u) Public Works and Roads Estimates Committee;
- (v) Sport, Recreation and Racing Estimates Committee;
- (w) State Development Estimates Committee;
- (x) Tourism Estimates Committee;
- (y) Transport Estimates Committee;

for the purpose of examining and reporting upon proposed expenditures from the Consolidated Fund for each organisational unit for each Minister listed in the tabled Estimates, and the corresponding clauses and schedules of the Appropriation Bill. Such proposed expenditure shall stand referred to the appropriate Committee.

- (2) The resolution shall set out, in respect of each Committee:
 - (a) the names of the Members to be appointed, of whom two shall be Government Members, two shall be Opposition Members and one shall be a non-Government Member nominated by the Leader of the Government.

(b) the name of the Member to be Chairman;

Page 6875

(c) the organisational units, and the corresponding clauses and schedules of the Appropriation Bill to be considered;

(d) the maximum period of time allocated for consideration of each Estimate; and

(e) the days, hours and place during which they shall meet.

(3) The Committees shall have power to send for and examine persons, papers, records and things and to report from time to time.

(4) The quorum of an Estimates Committee shall be eight Members provided that the Committees meet as Joint Committees at all times.

(5) The Chairman of an Estimates Committee shall exercise a deliberative vote, and, in the event of an equality of votes, a casting vote.

(6) A Chairman may from time to time appoint another Member to act as Deputy Chairman and the Member so appointed shall act as Chairman when the Chairman is not present at a meeting of the Committee.

In the event of absence of both the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman, a Member of the Committee shall be elected by the Members present to act as Chairman for that meeting.

(7) The proceedings of the Committees shall be open to the public unless otherwise ordered by the Committees.

(8) In an Estimates Committee:

(a) the responsible Minister shall be present at all times;

(b) the Chairman shall call over each program area of each organisational unit for each Minister and declare the proposed expenditure open for examination;

(c) the question shall be proposed for each organisational unit "That the Vote be recommended";

(d) the proceedings of a Committee shall be recorded by Hansard;

(e) the Clerk shall prepare minutes of meetings which shall be signed by the Chairman.

(9) Advisers who are present at an Estimates Committee to assist Ministers and the Presiding Officers (in the case of the Estimates of the Legislature) may address a Committee or answer questions if referred to them by a Minister or the Presiding Officers as the case may be.

(10) The proceedings of a Committee shall be regarded as proceedings of the Parliament.

(11) The Report of each Estimates Committee shall state whether the votes of each organisational unit in the Estimates and the corresponding clauses and schedules in the Appropriation Bill are recommended or otherwise.

The failure of an Estimates Committee to report on any part of the votes shall be deemed to be a report recommending the proposed expenditure.

(12) Upon conclusion of its deliberations and after the question on the second reading of the Appropriation Bill has been agreed to, a Member deputed by the Chairman of each Estimates Committee shall present the Committee's Report to the President in the House.

The Reports shall be set down for consideration in Committee of the Whole House on the Appropriation Bill.

Consideration of a Report in the Committee of the Whole House shall be deemed to be consideration

Page 6876

of those clauses and schedules of the Appropriation Bill referred to that Estimates Committee.

(13) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the Standing or Sessional Orders, Ministers may indicate to Estimates Committees that information supplementary to a response given to the Estimates Committee in reply to a question asked by a member of that Committee may be lodged with the Clerk of the Parliaments. Such information shall be regarded as part of the proceedings of the Parliament (and published as an annexure to the Questions and Answers Paper of the Legislative Council). Answers to questions taken on notice are to be answered by 26 November 1992.

Procedure in Committee of the Whole House

(14) In a Committee of the Whole House:

- (a) the Chairman shall put the Question in respect of each Committee Report, "That the Report of the (name of the Committee) be adopted"; and
- (b) those clauses and schedules of the Appropriation Bill not referred to an Estimates Committee shall be considered as one Question, "That the remaining clauses and schedules of the Bill be agreed to".

(15) At the conclusion of proceedings in Committee of the Whole, the Chairman shall report to the President that the Committee has or has not adopted the Reports from the Estimates Committees.

(16) A message informing the Legislative Assembly of the terms of the resolution and the Members to participate on each Committee shall be transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

Legislative Council
14 October 1992
President

M. F. Willis

Mr Speaker

The Legislative Council desires to inform the Legislative Assembly that it has this day agreed to the following resolution:

That:

- (1) The following Estimates Committees be appointed:

- (a) The Legislature Estimates Committee;
- (b) Premier and Treasurer Estimates Committee;
- (c) Aboriginal Affairs Estimates Committee;
- (d) Agriculture and Rural Affairs Estimates Committee;
- (e) Arts Estimates Committee;
- (f) Attorney-General Estimates Committee;
- (g) Conservation and Land Management and Energy Estimates Committee;
- (h) Chief Secretary and Administrative Services Estimates Committee;
- (i) Community Services Estimates Committee;
- (j) Consumer Affairs Estimates Committee;
- (k) Education and Training Estimates Committee;
- (l) Environment Estimates Committee;

Page 6877

- (m) Ethnic Affairs Estimates Committee;
 - (n) Health Estimates Committee;
 - (o) Industrial Relations and Employment and Training Estimates Committee;
 - (p) Justice and Emergency Services Estimates Committee;
 - (q) Local Government and Co-operatives Estimates Committee;
 - (r) Natural Resources Estimates Committee;
 - (s) Planning and Housing Estimates Committee;
 - (t) Police Estimates Committee;
 - (u) Public Works and Roads Estimates Committee;
 - (v) Sport, Recreation and Racing Estimates Committee;
 - (w) State Development Estimates Committee;
 - (x) Tourism Estimates Committee;
 - (y) Transport Estimates Committee.
- (2) The following Members be appointed to the Estimates Committees:

(a) The Legislature Estimates Committee;

Government Members - The Hon. Duncan Gay, M.L.C., and the Hon. John Ryan, M.L.C.

Opposition Members - The Hon. John Johnson, M.L.C., and the Hon. Paul O'Grady, M.L.C.

Non-Government Member - The Hon. Fred Nile, M.L.C.

(b) Premier and Treasurer Estimates Committee;

Government Members - The Hon. Stephen Mutch, M.L.C., and the Hon. James Samios, M.L.C.

Opposition Members - The Hon. Michael Egan, M.L.C., and the Hon. John Johnson, M.L.C.

Non-Government Member - The Hon. Fred Nile, M.L.C.

(c) Aboriginal Affairs Estimates Committee;

Government Members - The Hon. Douglas Moppett, M.L.C., and the Hon. James Samios, M.L.C.

Opposition Members - The Hon. Andrew Manson, M.L.C., and the Hon. Ian Macdonald, M.L.C.

Non-Government Member - The Hon. Elaine Nile, M.L.C.

(d) Agriculture and Rural Affairs Estimates Committee;

Government Members - The Hon. Richard Bull, M.L.C., and the Hon. Lloyd Coleman, M.L.C.

Opposition Members - The Hon. James Kaldis, M.L.C., and the Hon. Edward Obeid, M.L.C.

Non-Government Member - The Hon. Elisabeth Kirkby, M.L.C.

(e) Arts Estimates Committee;

Page 6878

Government Members - The Hon. Dr Marlene Goldsmith, M.L.C., and the Hon. James Samios, M.L.C.

Opposition Members - The Hon. Dr Meredith Burgmann, M.L.C., and the Hon. Ann Symonds, M.L.C.

Non-Government Member - The Hon. Elisabeth Kirkby, M.L.C.

(f) Attorney-General Estimates Committee;

Government Members - The Hon. Jenny Gardiner, M.L.C., and the Hon. Stephen Mutch, M.L.C.

Opposition Members - The Hon. Paul O'Grady, M.L.C., and the Hon. Bryan Vaughan, M.L.C.

Non-Government Member - The Hon. Fred Nile, M.L.C.

(g) Conservation and Land Management and Energy Estimates Committee;

Government Members - The Hon. Duncan Gay, M.L.C., and the Hon. Douglas Moppett, M.L.C.

Opposition Members - The Hon. Dr Meredith Burgmann, M.L.C., and the Hon. Dorothy Isaksen, M.L.C.
Non-Government Member - The Hon. Richard Jones, M.L.C.

(h) Chief Secretary and Administrative Services Estimates Committee;

Government Members - The Hon. Patricia Forsythe, M.L.C., and the Hon. Robert Rowland Smith, M.L.C.
Opposition Members - The Hon. Keith Enderbury, M.L.C., and the Hon. John Johnson, M.L.C.
Non-Government Member - The Hon. Fred Nile, M.L.C.

(i) Community Services Estimates Committee;

Government Members - The Hon. John Ryan, M.L.C., and the Hon. Helen Sham-Ho, M.L.C.
Opposition Members - The Hon. Ron Dyer, M.L.C., and the Hon. Ann Symonds, M.L.C.
Non-Government Member - The Hon. Elisabeth Kirkby, M.L.C.

(j) Consumer Affairs Estimates Committee;

Government Members - The Hon. Duncan Gay, M.L.C., and the Hon. Helen Sham-Ho, M.L.C.
Opposition Members - The Hon. Jan Burnswoods, M.L.C., and the Hon. Judith Walker, M.L.C.
Non-Government Member - The Hon. Elaine Nile, M.L.C.

(k) Education and Training Estimates Committee;

Government Members - The Hon. Richard Bull, M.L.C., and the Hon. Patricia Forsythe, M.L.C.
Opposition Members - The Hon. Franca Arena, M.L.C., and the Hon. Jan Burnswoods, M.L.C.
Non-Government Member - The Hon. Elaine Nile, M.L.C.

(l) Environment Estimates Committee;

Government Members - The Hon. Patricia Forsythe, M.L.C., and the Hon. John Ryan, M.L.C.
Opposition Members - The Hon. Jan Burnswoods, M.L.C., and the Hon. Delcia Kite, M.L.C.
Non-Government Member - The Hon. Richard Jones, M.L.C.

(m) Ethnic Affairs Estimates Committee;

Page 6879

Government Members - The Hon. John Ryan, M.L.C., and the Hon. James Samios, M.L.C.
Opposition Members - The Hon. Franca Arena, M.L.C., and the Hon. James Kaldis, M.L.C.
Non-Government Member - The Hon. Elaine Nile, M.L.C.

(n) Health Estimates Committee;

Government Members - The Hon. Beryl Evans, M.L.C., and the Hon. Dr Brian Pezzutti, M.L.C.

Opposition Members - The Hon. Franca Arena, M.L.C., and the Hon. Dorothy Isaksen, M.L.C.

Non-Government Member - The Hon. Elisabeth Kirkby, M.L.C.

(o) Industrial Relations and Employment and Training Estimates Committee;

Government Members - The Hon. Jenny Gardiner, M.L.C., and the Hon. Stephen Mutch, M.L.C.

Opposition Members - The Hon. Dr Meredith Burgmann, M.L.C., and the Hon. Jeffrey Shaw, M.L.C.

Non-Government Member - The Hon. Elisabeth Kirkby, M.L.C.

(p) Justice and Emergency Services Estimates Committee;

Government Members - The Hon. Jenny Gardiner, M.L.C., and the Hon. Dr Marlene Goldsmith, M.L.C.

Opposition Members - The Hon. Ron Dyer, M.L.C., and the Hon. Ann Symonds, M.L.C.

Non-Government Member - The Hon. Elisabeth Kirkby, M.L.C.

(q) Local Government and Co-operatives Estimates Committee;

Government Members - The Hon. Richard Bull, M.L.C., and the Hon. Beryl Evans, M.L.C.

Opposition Members - The Hon. Jeffrey Shaw, M.L.C., and the Hon. Judith Walker, M.L.C.

Non-Government Member - The Hon. Elaine Nile, M.L.C.

(r) Natural Resources Estimates Committee;

Government Members - The Hon. Douglas Moppett, M.L.C., and the Hon. Robert Rowland Smith, M.L.C.

Opposition Members - The Hon. Dorothy Isaksen, M.L.C., and the Hon. Delcia Kite, M.L.C.

Non-Government Member - The Hon. Richard Jones, M.L.C.

(s) Planning and Housing Estimates Committee;

Government Members - The Hon. Richard Bull, M.L.C., and the Hon. Patricia Forsythe, M.L.C.

Opposition Members - The Hon. Ron Dyer, M.L.C., and the Hon. Edward Obeid, M.L.C.

Non-Government Member - The Hon. Richard Jones, M.L.C.

(t) Police Estimates Committee;

Government Members - The Hon. Lloyd Coleman, M.L.C., and the Hon. Stephen Mutch, M.L.C.

Opposition Members - The Hon. Paul O'Grady, M.L.C., and the Hon. Judith Walker, M.L.C.

Non-Government Member - The Hon. Elaine Nile, M.L.C.

(u) Public Works and Roads Estimates Committee;

Page 6880

Government Members - The Hon. Lloyd Coleman, M.L.C., and the Hon. Douglas Moppett, M.L.C.

Opposition Members - The Hon. Michael Egan, M.L.C., and the Hon. Andrew Manson, M.L.C.

Non-Government Member - The Hon. Richard Jones, M.L.C.

(v) Sport, Recreation and Racing Estimates Committee;

Government Members - The Hon. Beryl Evans, M.L.C., and the Hon. Robert Rowland Smith, M.L.C.

Opposition Members - The Hon. Ian Macdonald, M.L.C., and the Hon. Andrew Manson, M.L.C.

Non-Government Member - The Hon. Fred Nile, M.L.C.

(w) State Development Estimates Committee;

Government Members - The Hon. Dr Brian Pezzutti, M.L.C., and the Hon. Helen Sham-Ho, M.L.C.

Opposition Members - The Hon. Ian Macdonald, M.L.C., and the Hon. Bryan Vaughan, M.L.C.

Non-Government Member - The Hon. Fred Nile, M.L.C.

(x) Tourism Estimates Committee;

Government Members - The Hon. Beryl Evans, M.L.C., and the Hon. Jenny Gardiner, M.L.C.

Opposition Members - The Hon. Keith Enderbury, M.L.C., and the Hon. Bryan Vaughan, M.L.C.

Non-Government Member - The Hon. Elisabeth Kirkby, M.L.C.

(y) Transport Estimates Committee;

Government Members - The Hon. Lloyd Coleman, M.L.C., and the Hon. Helen Sham-Ho., M.L.C.

Opposition Members - The Hon. Keith Enderbury, M.L.C. and the Hon. Edward Obeid, M.L.C.

Non-Government Member - The Hon. Fred Nile, M.L.C.

(3) The clauses and items of the Appropriation Bill set out in the first Schedule to this motion be referred to the Estimates Committees as set out in that Schedule.

(4) The times and dates for consideration of the estimates by the Estimates Committees be as set out in the second Schedule to this motion with the Chairman of the Committee calling on the next listed area as set out in the Schedule when its listed time is reached.

(5) During the conduct of the Estimates Committees questions be limited to a maximum of one minute and replies be limited to a maximum of three minutes.

(6) When each area of estimates in the first Schedule is commenced the period set aside shall be equally apportioned between Government and non-Government members. The Chairman of the Committee shall permit non-Government members to question the minister for the first twenty minutes: Government Members for the next twenty minutes and so on in rotation until the expiration of the allocated time.

(7) The Clerk of the Legislative Assembly arrange the places for meetings of the Committees and notify, formally, the Members of the Committees of the times and places for said meetings.

(8) The Chairmen of the Estimates Committees be:

- (a) The Legislature Estimates Committee - Mr Christopher Downy, M.P.
- (b) Premier and Treasurer Estimates Committee - Mr Phillip Smiles, M.P.
- (c) Aboriginal Affairs Estimates Committee - The Hon. James Samios, M.L.C.

Page 6881

- (d) Agriculture and Rural Affairs Estimates Committee - Mr James Small, M.P.
- (e) Arts Estimates Committee - The Hon. James Samios, M.L.C.
- (f) Attorney-General Estimates Committee - Mr Malcolm Kerr, M.P.
- (g) Conservation and Land Management and Energy Estimates Committee - Mr Raymond Chappell, M.P.
- (h) Chief Secretary and Administrative Services Estimates Committee - Mr Tony Packard, M.P.
- (i) Community Services Estimates Committee - The Hon. John Ryan, M.L.C.
- (j) Consumer Affairs Estimates Committee - Mr Russell Smith, M.P.
- (k) Education and Training Estimates Committee - Mr Christopher Downy, M.P.
- (l) Environment Estimates Committee - Mr Michael Photios, M.P.
- (m) Ethnic Affairs Estimates Committee - The Hon. James Samios, M.L.C.
- (n) Health Estimates Committee - The Hon. Dr Brian Pezzutti, M.L.C.
- (o) Industrial Relations and Employment and Training Estimates Committee - Mr Barry Morris, M.P.
- (p) Justice and Emergency Services Estimates Committee - Mr Albert Schultz, M.P.
- (q) Local Government and Co-operatives Estimates Committee - Mr John Turner, M.P.
- (r) Natural Resources Estimates Committee - Mr Bruce Jeffery, M.P.
- (s) Planning and Housing Estimates Committee - The Hon. Richard Bull, M.L.C.

- (t) Police Estimates Committee - The Hon. Stephen Mutch, M.L.C.
 - (u) Public Works and Roads Estimates Committee - Mr Don Beck, M.P.
 - (v) Sport, Recreation and Racing Estimates Committee - Mr Ivan Petch, M.P.
 - (w) State Development Estimates Committee - Mr Tony Packard, M.P.
 - (x) Tourism Estimates Committee - Mr Ivan Petch, M.P.
 - (y) Transport Estimates Committee - Mr Ian Glachan, M.P.
- (9) The Committees have the power to sit during the sitting or any adjournment of the House.

Legislative Council
14 October 1992

M. F. Willis
President

FIRST SCHEDULE

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES - MINISTERIAL PORTFOLIO ALLOCATIONS

		Appropriation Bill	References*
		Recurrent Items	Capital Item
1	The Legislature Legislature	6(1)01	6(2)01

2	Premier and Treasurer		
	Premier	7(1)01-06	7(2)01-04
	Treasury	7(1)07-09	7(2)05,06
	Government Pricing Tribunal	7(1)10	-
3	Aboriginal Affairs		
	Aboriginal Affairs	**	**
4	Agriculture and Rural Affairs		
	Agriculture and Rural Affairs	8(1)01,02	8(2)01,02
5	Arts		
	Arts	26(1)02-09	26(2)02-08
6	Attorney General		
	Attorney General	9(1)01-04	9(2)01-03
7	Conservation and Land Management and Energy		
	Conservation and Land Management	12(1)01	12(2)01
	Energy	12(1)02	-
8	Chief Secretary and Administrative Services		
	Chief Secretary	{10(1)01	{10(2)01
	Administrative Services	{10(1)03 ****	{10(2)03 ****
	Casino Control Authority	10(1)02	10(2)02
9	Community Services		
	Community Services	11(1)01	11(2)01
10	Consumer Affairs		
	Consumer Affairs	13(1)01	13(2)01
11	Education and Youth Affairs		
	School Education and Youth Affairs	14(1)01,02	14(2)01,02
12	Environment		
	Environment	15(1)01-05	15(2)01-05
13	Ethnic Affairs		
	Ethnic Affairs	16(1)01	-
14	Health		
	Health	17(1)01	17(2)01
15	Industrial Relations and Employment and Training		
	Industrial Relations	14(1)03	14(2)03
	Technical and Further Education	18(1)01 ***	18(2)01 ***

	Training and Further Education	18(1)01 ***	18(2)01 ***
16	Justice and Emergency Services		
	Justice	19(2)01-03	19(2)01-04
	Emergency Services	23(2)03	23(1)03-04

17	Local Government and Cooperatives		
	Local Government and Cooperatives	20(1)01	20(2)01
18	Natural Resources		
	Natural Resources	21(1)01-04	21(2)01-04
19	Planning and Housing		
	Planning	22(1)01	22(2)01
	Housing	22(1)02	22(2)02
20	Police		
	Police	23(1)01-02	23(2)01-02
21	Public Works and Roads		
	Public Works and Roads	24(1)01,02	24(2)01,02
22	Sport, Recreation and Racing		
	Sport, Recreation and Racing	25(1)01	25(2)01
23	State Development		
	State Development	26(1)01	26(2)01
24	Tourism		
	Tourism	27(1)02	-
25	Transport		
	Transport	27(1)01	27(2)01

* Reference is to Section, Subsection (1 = Recurrent; 2 = Capital) and Item

** Not distinguishable within Appropriation Bill from Premier's Department (7(1)03 and 7(2)03)

*** Appropriation Bill does not distinguish "Industrial Relations and Employment" from "Further Education and Training". Joint appropriation to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Employment and Training for the Department of Industrial Relations, Employment, Training and Further Education

**** Appropriation Bill Combines "Office of the Chief Secretary and Minister for Administrative Services"

SECOND SCHEDULE

BUDGET ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

- Tuesday, 20 October 1992 -

COMMITTEE NO. 4

2.30 pm - 4.30 pm - Agriculture and Rural Affairs (Hon Ian Armstrong MP)

COMMITTEE NO. 10
2.30 pm - 4.30 pm - Consumer Affairs (Hon Kerry Chikarovski MP)

- Wednesday, 21 October 1992 -

COMMITTEE NO. 25
9.30 am - 1.00 pm - Transport (Hon Bruce Baird MP)

COMMITTEE NO. 12
9.30 am - 1.00 pm - Environment (Hon Chris Hartcher MP)

Page 6884

COMMITTEE NO. 7
2.30 pm - 4.30 pm - Conservation and Land Management and Energy (Hon Garry West MP)

COMMITTEE NO. 24
2.30 pm - 4.30 pm - Tourism (Hon Bruce Baird MP)

- Thursday, 22 October 1992 -

COMMITTEE NO. 19
9.30 am - 1.00 pm - Planning and Housing (Hon Robert Webster MP)

COMMITTEE NO. 1
9.30 am - 1.00 pm - The Legislature (Presiding Officers)

COMMITTEE NO. 8
2.30 pm - 4.30 pm - Chief Secretary and Administrative Services (Hon Anne Cohen MP)

COMMITTEE NO. 13
2.30 pm - 3.30 pm - Ethnic Affairs (Hon George Souris MP)

COMMITTEE NO. 5
3.30 pm - 4.30 pm - Arts (Hon Peter Collins MP)

- Friday, 23 October 1992 -

COMMITTEE NO. 17
9.30 am - 1.00 pm - Local Government and Cooperatives (Hon Gerry Peacocke MP)

COMMITTEE NO. 6
9.30 am - 1.00 pm - Attorney General (Hon John Hannaford MLC)

COMMITTEE NO. 18
2.30 pm - 4.30 pm - Natural Resources (Hon Ian Causley MP)

COMMITTEE NO. 23
2.30 pm - 4.30 pm - State Development (Hon Peter Collins MP)

- Tuesday, 10 November 1992 -

- COMMITTEE NO. 16
2.30 pm - 4.30 pm - Justice and Emergency Services (Hon Ted Pickering MLC)
- COMMITTEE NO. 22
2.30 pm - 4.30 pm - Sport, Recreation and Racing (Hon Joe Schipp MP)
- Wednesday, 11 November 1992 -
- COMMITTEE NO. 20
9.30 am - 1.00 pm - Police (Hon Terry Griffiths MP)
- COMMITTEE NO. 14
9.30 am - 1.00 pm - Health (Hon Ron Phillips MP)
- COMMITTEE NO. 15
2.30 pm - 4.30 pm - Industrial Relations (Hon John Hannaford MLC - joint
Committee)
- Employment and Training (Hon Virginia Chadwick MLC - joint
Committee)
- COMMITTEE NO. 3
2.30 pm - 4.30 pm - Aboriginal Affairs (Hon John Fahey MP)
- Thursday, 12 November 1992 -

Page 6885

- COMMITTEE NO. 21
9.30 am - 1.00 pm - Public Works and Roads (Hon Wal Murray MP)
- COMMITTEE NO. 11
9.30 am - 1.00 pm - Education and Youth Affairs (Hon Virginia Chadwick MLC)
- COMMITTEE NO. 9
2.30 pm - 4.30 pm - Community Services (Hon Jim Longley MP)
- COMMITTEE NO. 2
2.30 pm - 4.30 pm - Premier and Treasurer (Hon John Fahey MP and Hon George
Souris MP)
- Friday, 13 November 1992 -
- 9.00 am - 4.30 pm - Committee of the Whole House

REGISTER OF DISCLOSURES

Mr Speaker laid upon the table a copy of the Register of Disclosures by members of the Legislative Assembly as at 30th June, 1992.

Ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS Serious Traffic Offence Penalties

Petitions praying that laws relating to road accident fatality or injury be

re-evaluated, received from **Mr Jeffery, Mr Mills, Mr Newman and Mr Price.**

Fassifern Railway Station

Petition praying that disabled car parking spaces be provided on the western side of the Fassifern railway station and that access ramps to the existing overhead walkway bridge be constructed, received from **Mr Hunter.**

Public Transport Access for the Disabled

Petition praying that the House consider the needs of the disabled and allow the dogs they rely on for mobility the same access to public transport as guide dogs, received from **Mr Ziolkowski.**

Court House for Toronto

Petition praying that the Government provide for the construction of a Westlakes court house complex for Toronto, received from **Mr Hunter.**

Brothels

Petitions praying that the Government will not take steps to legalise brothels but will close all existing brothels by enforcing the Disorderly Houses Act, received from **Mr Harrison and Mr Tink.**

Hunter Sewer Service Access Charge

Page 6886

Petition praying that the parameters of the sewer service access charge of the Hunter Water Corporation be modified, received from **Mr Hunter.**

Lidcombe Hospital

Petitions praying that because of dissatisfaction with the rationalisation of health services the House prevent the downgrading and possible closure of services at Lidcombe Hospital, received from **Mr Rogan and Mr Shedden.**

Ingleburn and Macquarie Fields Police Stations

Petition praying that the House provide, as a matter of urgency, a permanent police station at Ingleburn and upgrade the existing police station at Macquarie Fields, received from **Mr Knowles.**

Woy Woy Peninsula Police

Petition praying that the Parliament give urgent consideration to allocating additional police to the Woy Woy peninsula to alleviate vandalism, hooliganism and street crime, received from **Mr Doyle.**

COMMITTEE ON THE DEFAMATION BILL

Report - Minutes - Evidence

Mr KERR (Cronulla) [4.32]: I bring up and lay upon the table of the House the report and minutes of proceedings of and evidence taken before the Legislation Committee upon the Defamation Bill.

Ordered to be printed.

Mr KERR, by leave: The importance of defamation law to ordinary citizens should not be underestimated as defamation law has as much application within the context of the meaning of a body corporate, committee, local football club and election campaign, as it does in the political arena. Even the simple task of writing an accurate reference may potentially be a defamatory action, where, for example, qualified privilege will quickly become more than an academic concern. In the course of its proceedings the committee recognised the complexities of issues raised and came to the view that it was unable to make specific recommendations on the discrete clauses of the bill. Instead the committee is of the firm conviction that the community would be best served by its referring the bill in its entirety, together with the committee's recommendations on major issues, to the Law Reform Commission of New South Wales, whose expertise will enable a comprehensive review of defamation law in New South Wales.

In its review the committee has not only considered the bill on a clause by clause basis but has also attempted to step back and evaluate its overall effectiveness. The committee is aware that defamation law reform review is occurring throughout the western world. For example, the United Kingdom has been involved in a long process of defamation law reform with committees such as that chaired by Sir David Calcutt, QC, private member's bills introduced by Clive Soley, M.P., and the bill drafted by Mr Justice Hoffman, which was introduced into the House of Lords, all aimed at defamation law that is fair to all. The Annenberg program of Northwestern University in the United States of America has also examined ways and means of simplifying and

Page 6887

accelerating the procedures for dealing with defamation complaints. There seems to be a general trend towards the creation of a new tort of invasion of privacy and the introduction of mechanisms to ensure a right of reply to factual inaccuracies or, rather, misstatements. There is also a universal examination of procedural reforms with a view towards summary of fast track procedures, greater disclosure, reduction of delay and judicial control of proceedings. These are measures which will serve the public interest by reducing costs and deliver speedier justice.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Private Members' Statements: Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders

Motion, by leave, by Mr West agreed to:

That so much of the standing and sessional orders be suspended as would preclude private members' statements being taken after determination of the matter of public importance submitted this day.

SYDNEY (KINGSFORD-SMITH) AIRPORT THIRD RUNWAY

Matter of Public Importance

Mr J. H. MURRAY (Drummoyne) [4.38]: I move:

That this House notes as a matter of public importance

- (1) The Government's unannounced expenditure on the third runway without commensurate expenditure being budgeted for Badgerys Creek infrastructure.
- (2) The Government's failure to provide a full and detailed costing of its commitments to the third runway.

Revelations in Government documents now in the hands of anti third runway groups have exploded this Government's public relations myth about the cost effectiveness of the third runway. Those documents have certainly highlighted the true cost of the third runway to the taxpayers of New South Wales. The documents clearly show that this Government will face costs and loss of assets between a minimum of \$480 million and a maximum of \$1.3 billion. To put that into perspective, the State Budget which has just been brought down had a total expenditure of \$17 billion. The maximum figure of \$1.3 billion that this Government will expend on the third runway is about one sixteenth of the total budget. The tragedy of the revelations in these documents is that the third runway costs will now be either double or treble the original estimates put forward by this Government in its attempt to convince the taxpayers of New South Wales of the viability of a third runway as opposed to accelerating the construction of a second major airport at Badgerys Creek.

Where will the money go? The Roads and Traffic Authority will expend a maximum of \$956.5 million an increase from a minimum of \$281.5 million. I notice that the Minister who is involved in much of this expenditure does not even have the courtesy or the guts to come into this House and face the music. The Opposition has ministerial documents which support those figures. The Maritime Services Board will expend a maximum of \$141.9 million, including loss of sand in Botany Bay with a maximum valuation of \$59 million or a minimum valuation of \$38 million. The Department of Minerals and Energy will expend a maximum of \$164 million and a minimum of \$149

Page 6888

million; the Department of Health a maximum of \$6.7 million and a minimum of \$3.6 million; New South Wales Agriculture and New South Wales Fisheries \$4.7 million; the National Parks and Wildlife Service \$2.3 million - a total cost of \$1.3 billion. Those figures are in 1992 terms. All honourable members know that when the third runway comes to fruition that figure will be much exceeded.

This major blowout has the same aura of intrigue about it as the Eastern Creek fiasco. Honourable members might remember that the Eastern Creek fiasco was to have cost \$2 million but, according to the Auditor-General, it ended up costing \$87 million. If associated costs are included, Eastern Creek cost a total of \$107 million. This proposed third runway is another Eastern Creek. A major sleight of hand has been exposed by these secret documents. The New South Wales Government has handed over ownership of parts of Botany Bay to the Federal Airports Corporation, thus obviating the need for the State Government to avoid challenges to its own planning legislation. According to State documents, in this grubby exercise the Government has forgone about \$400 million in the transfer of land. I have yet to hear or see one press statement from any Minister - whether it be the Minister for Transport, and Minister for Tourism or the Minister for State Development, and Minister for Arts - outlining the abysmal compensation Treasury will receive from this land transfer. The Government has been forced to sell the GIO to cover its economically inept financial decisions in relation to the costing of the third runway.

We need go no further than to look at the sand extraction debacle. These

documents clearly show that, through an independent valuation commissioned by the Maritime Services Board, sand extracted from Botany Bay would be worth a minimum of \$13.5 million or a maximum of \$57 million. Yet this financially inept Government has agreed to a lousy \$5.4 million for this most valuable public asset. The third runway has become a messy can of worms. The taxpayers of New South Wales have not been told the truth. It was interesting to read a recent report prepared by Coopers and Lybrand which shows how much of a financial loss will be incurred by residents who live under the flightpath. The real costs of the runway have been concealed from taxpayers. Now residents face huge losses because of devaluations of their properties. People owning and living in properties in Marrickville will face losses of up to \$44,000 on their homes. For people living in Leichhardt that figure will increase to \$51,000. Areas such as Drummoyne and Hunters Hill will suffer similar decreases in home values. The third runway will prove to be not only expensive for taxpayers but also unsafe. The third runway will increase the chances of a major disaster. We have heard not one word from the Government, or from any Minister, about the recent El Al 747 crash in Amsterdam. Honourable members might not realise that there is a close parallel between the operations of Amsterdam airport and Sydney (Kingsford-Smith) Airport.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I draw to the attention of the honourable member for Drummoyne that he is straying far from his motion. The text of the motion does not permit broad-ranging debate on the general question of aircraft operations at Mascot; it is to do with infrastructure costs. The honourable member must confine himself to remarks about those matters.

Mr J. H. MURRAY: I was making the point that additional costs would be incurred as a consequence. Because of the similarity between the Amsterdam disaster -

Mr Collins: On a point of order. The honourable member for Drummoyne is obviously ignoring the ruling you have just given. He seeks to persist with his argument and is drawing alleged parallels with the situation in Amsterdam. He should be asked to return to the motion.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! It was abundantly clear to the Chair that the
Page 6889
honourable member for Drummoyne had just returned to reading his prepared speech. I ask him to return to the text of the motion. If he does not, the only alternative is for the Chair to ask him to resume his seat.

Mr J. H. MURRAY: The dredging of Botany Bay is another example of the Government's lack of concern for the environment and for taxpayers. No guarantee has been given that New South Wales will be compensated for the 400 hectares of Maritime Services Board land, which is worth between \$300 million and \$400 million. Commercial fishermen will be devastated economically by the proposed dredging. In their most productive fishing grounds they are facing losses of up to \$400,000. The Premier and Deputy Premier cannot get their act together. When this cover-up was revealed the Premier promised to examine the \$1.3 billion estimate, but hours later the Minister for Transport, and Minister for Tourism said that the figures were wrong. Who can we believe? However, it was interesting that the next day a spokesperson for the Premier said that the State Government was happy with its financial arrangements. We received no further amplification of the exact costs of this third runway. No detailed explanation was given to establish how much it will cost the taxpayers of New South Wales, because it is a cover-up. Today the Premier had to come into this House and move a motion to establish a committee. He is trying to do the same thing with this third runway, in the hope that the issue will go away. It will not go away. If I closed my

eyes and listened to Premier Fahey talking, I could mistakenly believe it was ex-Premier Greiner addressing us. We have heard the same humbug and rhetoric concerning the third runway that we heard when we were questioning the Government about the costs of Eastern Creek.

The viability of the third runway is a myth which the Government is perpetuating at the expense of the taxpayers of New South Wales. It is a myth that the cost of the runway will not exceed half a billion dollars. In effect, these published documents from government departments show that the third runway could cost up to \$1.3 billion. The cost of infrastructure alone associated with runway roadworks could reach \$1 billion. On the one hand we have a myth being peddled by the Government's public relations machine and, on the other hand, we have the reality. The myth is that the third runway will be the quickest option and provide the best value for money. The reality is that, at a cost of \$400 million, an airport with domestic and some international facilities can be built at Badgerys Creek within five years. If an airport were built at Badgerys Creek, aircraft movement capacity would increase by 300,000 per year. The proposed third runway at Sydney (Kingsford-Smith) Airport will take four to six years to build. We have documents to prove that associated infrastructure will cost in excess of \$1 billion.

The myth is that the third runway will not be a safety hazard. That is a myth if we look at recent overseas events. The myth is that a second airport at Badgerys Creek is not an alternative. The reality is that established airline operators will object to any site for a second airport. An alternative airport will have to be built even if a third runway is constructed at Sydney (Kingsford-Smith) Airport. By developing Badgerys Creek now we can avoid crippling environmental problems, escalating costs and all the hassles associated with the third runway. Another cost - a cost which one cannot put one's finger on - concerns aircraft delays. Aircraft queue delays, ground delays, unimpeded taxi time and arrival delays all result in costs to the community. These infrastructure costs - taxiing to the airport and aircraft circling the airport - have to be built into the overall cost. In 1989 delays at Sydney (Kingsford-Smith) Airport, on average, were 20.4 minutes. If a third runway was built that delay would increase to 32 minutes. That would affect tourism and cause problems for the business community and our economy. If an airport were built at Badgerys Creek aircraft delays would be reduced to six minutes.

Page 6890

This Government has not attempted to evaluate this cost in any of its environmental impact statements, but this cost has to be built into the equation. The documents we have in our possession have highlighted the fact that these costs have not been fully identified in any government environmental impact statement. It is apparent that the cost to the State Government of this third runway could be \$1.35 billion, but the maximum return could be only \$5.4 million. The costs to the Australian Government are estimated by the Federal Department of the Arts, Sport, the Environment, Tourism and Territories to be \$319 million. The Federal Government is spending \$319 million on the third runway and the State is asked to spend \$1.35 million. Thus, the costs to the State Government of the third runway will exceed the costs to the Australian Government. The Australian Government owns the third runway; it is a Federal Government project. It is apparent from the documents in our possession that the Government is involved in a massive cover-up at the expense of the taxpayers of New South Wales. I am sure the Minister will deny the contents of some of these documents. These are official documents signed by departmental officers who have given accurate assessments and in some cases obviously the Government will not accept them.

Mr COLLINS (Willoughby - Minister for State Development, and Minister for Arts) [4.50]: I lead for the Government in speaking against the motion put by the honourable member for Drummoyne, and I will be joined shortly by the Minister for Transport and by other speakers on behalf of the Government. One has to ask oneself whether or not the Opposition is in touch with reality. Everyone in this State knows there has to be a third runway at Mascot if we are to keep up with the rest of the world and keep up with the demand by air travellers for improved flying times and opportunities. These travellers constitute ordinary people who simply want to travel overseas for a holiday, or perhaps small businessmen and businesswomen seeking opportunities and markets overseas or elsewhere in Australia. If the Labor Party is vaguely serious about coming to terms with those needs and demands, it will support what the Government is doing. The Government is committed to providing a third runway at the earliest possible moment.

A little knowledge is a dangerous thing. I have not seen the documents referred to by the honourable member for Drummoyne today, but I take it they are the documents referred to in press reports earlier in the week. If so, these documents represent very early internal estimates which, as presented, are attributed to the construction and operation of a third runway. In other words, they may even be first draft documents. They are very early documents and have been superseded by many others. In early 1991, State Government agencies considered a range of information including the draft planning strategy for Sydney airport prepared by the Federal Airports Corporation. This exercise was aimed at defining possible parameters for negotiations with the Commonwealth or the FAC in respect of development of Sydney airport and the third runway. Before going into detailed explanations of how the figures quoted in the *Sydney Morning Herald* article of 8th October were derived, I would like members of this House to be aware that, in contrast to the terms of the motion moved by the honourable member for Drummoyne, the State Government is not committing any additional expenditure to infrastructure and services than it would have normally considered without the third runway.

The *Sydney Morning Herald* article referred in part to the details of the final agreements between the Commonwealth, the FAC and the State which were beneficial to the State. These include compensation for roadworks which relate to the construction and operation of the third runway and the operation of the airport, the closure and extension of Ninth Street and the extension of Qantas Drive, the provision of a direct grade separated connection at the junction of Airport Drive and Marsh Street, the Giovanni Brunetti Bridge. These works are to be fully funded and constructed by the FAC. I understand there have been consultations between the FAC, the Roads and

Page 6891

Traffic Authority and Botany Municipal Council on these works. Preliminary cost estimates are between \$4 million and \$5 million. A set of early figures for roadworks referred to in the *Sydney Morning Herald* article on 8th October were derived in part from works outlined in the draft planning strategy for Sydney airport to well into the next century. They also included possible Roads and Traffic Authority works in the next decade, including the F5 and F6 freeways. These estimates are not directly related to the third runway.

The range of works outlined in the draft strategy will be matters to be considered in more detail by the FAC as and when the need arises. I expect these works to be funded by the FAC and anticipate full consultation with all relevant State agencies, including my own. The *Sydney Morning Herald* article further referred to costs to the Maritime Services Board and the Department of Mineral Resources. It should be

obvious to members of this House that there was substantial double counting in adding to estimates for the same resources. The figures quoted comprised valuations of land under the third runway as well as a valuation of fill. The early estimates used in arriving at the figures utilised a number of valuation techniques. The maximum land values were based on the highest industrial values, which are unrealistic for submerged land. The Maritime Services Board land was transferred for the nominal amount of \$1 for two main reasons. The first is that the State did not want the FAC's asset to be increased by the market value of the Maritime Services Board land because the FAC would be forced by its legislation to automatically increase its charges to obtain a return on this asset. The State thus prevented the value of its land inadvertently penalising the transport and tourism sector. Second, the main benefits of the third runway will accrue to the State in growth, in airport related industries and tourism and associated job creation. Therefore, the State could afford to forgo some up-front revenue from the sale of assets in return for future dividends in the air transport industry and also in tourism opportunities.

Finally, New South Wales retains first claim on the land if ever it ceases to be a runway. A caveat has been lodged with the Registrar General. The compensation for New South Wales for fill is calculated to cover the real value to the State, taking into account the potential future port development. Fill valuations used a variety of commercial data collected by the Department of Mineral Resources. These values were re-assessed based on precedents for construction of State projects. Valuation of the sand was based on its value as fill, not on any alternative use. This is reasonable because most of the sand was probably destined to be moved for future port works. Consequently, there is no loss to the State by using the fill for runway construction. The current FAC estimate is that approximately 14 million cubic metres of sand fill will be required for the construction of the third runway. The fill will come from both port and non-port sources in Botany Bay in accordance with the environmental impact statement for the third runway.

The \$5.4 million paid to the State represents payment for 4 million cubic metres of fill to be drawn from areas not designated for potential future port development. In effect, the State will receive full payment for the sale of sand outside possible port development areas. Sand from within the port will be provided at no charge in recognition of the potential that its removal provides for development of additional port improvements. As a component of future port expansion, this dredging work is a saving to the State. To conclude on this point, final agreements on land and fill recognise the following principles. First, benefits to this State of dredging for potential future port development in Botany Bay. New South Wales traded its sand for work to be undertaken which would ultimately benefit the State. This avoids any direct budget expense and frees money for other social priorities, something to which everybody in this House is committed.

Page 6892

The second principle is the potential reacquisition of the land and runway should the airport cease to be used for aviation purposes. The third is the current rate of royalty to the State as a basis for calculation of payment from the FAC to the State for fill extracted from any other area in Botany Bay. Other costs mentioned in the *Sydney Morning Herald* article to which I referred relate to studies and resources sought by State environmental agencies in relation to the project. I am pleased to advise the House that the FAC, following full consultation with appropriate State agencies, completed stage one of its environmental management plan for Botany Bay in June 1992. The plan outlines in detail proposed management actions in regard to the issues raised by agencies such as New South Wales Fisheries, the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the

Environment Protection Authority. The FAC has commissioned and is funding a number of studies requested by those agencies, and there is continuing and ongoing consultation and participation by those agencies. In regard to the other services costs, for example, water and sewerage requirements, the FAC will meet all the costs of works required in conjunction with the construction and operation of the third runway. Therefore there will be no unannounced expenditure by the State Government on the third runway.

The issue of staged development of Badgerys Creek Airport was recently considered in a submission to the Federal Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works at a hearing on development of stage one of the airport. In fact the *Sydney Morning Herald* figure of \$852 million is incorrectly attributed to road and rail access at Badgerys Creek. The environmental impact statement supplement for the third runway included estimates provided by the Roads and Traffic Authority and State Rail to the Commonwealth Department of Transport and Communications: for roadworks, \$852 million and rail works \$600 million to a fully developed airport between the years 2000 and 2010 at Badgerys Creek, should the third runway not proceed. Those figures do not include costs of land acquisitions, relocation of services, rolling-stock, et cetera. The State does not have the resources to fund such major infrastructure works. That was made abundantly clear at a meeting last night that involved the honourable member for Liverpool, the Mayor of Liverpool and other representatives of the Liverpool council. Had a Federal decision been made to proceed immediately with a major international or domestic airport at Badgerys Creek, the State would have sought funding for those works from the Federal Government.

The hidden costs attributed to the State Government for the third runway project, according to the *Sydney Morning Herald* article of 8th October - that is, a maximum of \$1.3 billion and a minimum of \$480 million - are therefore incorrectly attributed to construction and operation of the third runway. The costs reported represent not only works not required for the project but also projections of infrastructure works for the Sydney region which may not proceed, as well as significant double counting and overestimates. As an outcome of negotiations with the FAC and the Commonwealth Government the third runway project will cost the State no additional expenditure on infrastructure and services. The only expenditure may be on regional transport infrastructure, which would have been carried out in any event over the next decade, and no doubt will be addressed by my colleague the Minister for Transport, and Minister for Tourism. The third runway environmental impact statement supplement estimated the cost of construction of the runway as \$320 million. Those costs will be fully borne by the FAC. For the reasons I have outlined the Government flatly rejects today's claims by the honourable member for Drummoyne and the misleading figures presented by the *Sydney Morning Herald*.

The State will benefit considerably from the expenditure by the FAC on the construction of the runway, the upgrading of the airport and funding of a number of measures for the management of the environment of Botany Bay. It is evident that even if the honourable member for Drummoyne and other members of the Opposition do not

Page 6893

support the third runway, the people of New South Wales do support it. They will be the ones who will use it. It is long overdue and should have been in place years ago. Members on this side of the House know that; members on the other side of the House know it also. It is critical that the third runway be in place as quickly as possible. If it is not, everyone knows that we will lose out to other States that have bitten the bullet in regard to airport development and the good things that flow from it. We must stop treating airport development as some terrible scourge on the community. The fact is that

it is the community that uses airports. Airports are not used by a privileged few; they are used by men and women throughout Australia for a variety of social and commercial reasons. And so it should be. We want that third runway in place as quickly as possible and we want and expect that the FAC will meet the costs of the third runway. Accordingly, the Government rejects the Opposition's motion.

Mr MOSS (Canterbury) [5.5]: I support this matter of public importance. I refer first to the second part of the motion, which criticises the Government for its failure to provide full and detailed costing of its commitment to the third runway. It is obvious to Opposition members why the Government has not provided full and detailed costing of its commitment. The Government is embarrassed because it finds itself responsible for costs of about \$1.3 billion merely for the privilege of seeing the Federal Government expand an airport that has already reached saturation point as an international airport. The New South Wales Government is embarrassed because it must meet those costs, which should be shared more equally between the Federal Government and the State Government. New South Wales has fallen for the big bluff. It has been bluffed by the Federal Government into that expenditure. That occurred particularly when it was learned that the decision would be fairly evenly balanced and could be tipped in favour of Badgerys Creek if additional costs were loaded on to the third runway proposal. The New South Wales Government sat back and decided that it should not do anything about the matter or argue for a share of infrastructure costs but rather should go it alone. The Government fell for that line, despite the fact that at about the same time a State Government official advised that the Federal Government would not choose Badgerys Creek because it was not willing to spend up to \$852 million on rail and road access - an amount this Government was not prepared to spend either.

The motion is critical of the Government for going overboard with its support for the expansion of Sydney (Kingsford-Smith) Airport, where it is spending more than it should. The Government has even accepted, or I thought it had, a measly \$5.4 million for the sale of sand that is valued at about \$57 million. According to the Minister for State Development the Government is giving away the sand free of charge. It seems that New South Wales will lose out by about \$57 million in that regard. At the same time the Government is unwilling to do anything about funding infrastructure for the Badgerys Creek Airport. Sydney's major airport needs for the future rightly should be met by having an airport at Badgerys Creek. I know why the Government has proceeded with this overexpenditure on Sydney (Kingsford-Smith) Airport. First, a lot of pressure has been put on it to proceed with the third runway by the rural sector, which seems to prefer to have an international airport at Mascot. Naturally the business community wants Mascot to be expanded for the sake of the central business district. Also pressure has been put on members opposite by their own constituents who would prefer to leave their North Shore homes and use Mascot as the first port of call on their way to Paris than to go out to Badgerys Creek. That has much to do with this issue.

The Government's support for a new runway at Sydney (Kingsford-Smith) Airport is so strong that one could be forgiven for thinking that Badgerys Creek was not a part of New South Wales. Sooner or later something will happen at Badgerys Creek

Page 6894

and it will be a tragedy that because of this Government's inaction the necessary plans will not be in place. Infrastructure, particularly transport, at Badgerys Creek will do more than benefit a new airport in that area; it will benefit all western Sydney. Once again the Government has shown a callous disregard for the people of western Sydney. The Government is two-faced. First, it has not pushed for a share of the infrastructure costs to be allocated by the Federal Government towards the cost of this runway -
[Time expired.]

Mr BAIRD: (Northcott - Minister for Transport, and Minister for Tourism) [5.10]: Honourable members opposite have been speaking unadulterated rubbish. Every resident of Sydney knows that this third runway is necessary. If Opposition members were genuine, they would support the construction of a third runway. It has even received the endorsement of their colleagues in Canberra. It is incredible that the Opposition would move such a motion in this House. A third runway is essential to promote tourism. Approximately 68 per cent of international tourists to Australia come via Sydney. Tourism is our No. 1 revenue earner; it is important for business. The third runway should have been built 10 years ago but, because the Labor Party could not get its act together, the disgraceful situation remains. Even the honourable member for Canterbury had something significant to say about the figure mentioned of \$1.6 billion.

Mr J. H. Murray: \$1.3 billion.

Mr BAIRD: The honourable member knows that is rubbish. The *Sydney Morning Herald* got it wrong, and the honourable member knows it. The State agreed to the compulsory acquisition of the runway site by the Commonwealth for a nominal consideration of \$1. That is because an additional amount will be included in the overall costs of using the runway. The \$1 transfer fee will ensure that the site will not be capitalised on the books of the FAC and that the asset value will not increase with a flow-on to aviation charges. New South Wales has the first right of reacquisition and is entitled to 50 per cent of the profit. Clearly the runway will be built. But if it is not, and if the site is not reacquired, New South Wales is entitled to 50 per cent of the sale of the site on the open market. Opposition members know that the peripheral ambit claim of \$1.3 billion is a nonsense. If dredging of Port Botany goes ahead, the cost of the dredging will be at least as great as the value of the sand. However, some sand will come from other areas. In relation to that the FAC will be paid a lump sum of \$5.4 million. The claim by the honourable member for Canterbury that there will be no payment is completely wrong. Revenue has not been lost. New South Wales is gaining from this overall exercise; it will not be faced with any costs. This State is not making a financial contribution towards this project - and I emphasise that - despite the claims of the *Sydney Morning Herald* and the honourable member for Drummoyne. Such claims are nonsense.

The original compensation claims link the runway with a variety of roads projects and environmental remediation initiatives but these were of an ambit nature. There will be no instantaneous increase in traffic on completion of the runway. Road and other transport infrastructure will increase incrementally over the many years as a result of various initiatives, not merely the construction of the runway. The FAC has undertaken to significantly improve the two major road connections to the airport, and that will benefit the State. The FAC will bear all the costs of relocating water and sewerage services. Further, it has agreed to participate with State agencies in the development and implementation of an environmental and management plan for Botany Bay. The FAC is committed to funding any environmental remediation which is shown to be attributable to construction operations of the third runway. The Director-General

Page 6895

of Transport led the negotiations, but the responsibility now rests with the Director-General of State Development. This long overdue runway is being built by the Federal and State governments. New South Wales has given the Commonwealth the opportunity to acquire the land for \$1. Appropriate compensation is being provided, where necessary, but no additional costs will be incurred by the State Government. Everyone knows that. Members of the Opposition should acknowledge the importance of the third runway to the economic development of this State.

Ms NORI (Port Jackson) [5.15]: Articles in the *Sydney Morning Herald* have made for interesting reading. It is correct to assume that in relation to the third runway what the Government has done will make the Eastern Creek Raceway look like a sideshow. Once again the New South Wales taxpayer has been saddled with billions and billions of dollars in costs. The Federal Airports Corporation is proposing to spend \$320 million to build the third runway. However, documents obtained under subpoena by a citizens group which is fighting the construction of the third runway show that the New South Wales Government is facing runway related costs amounting to between a disastrous \$480 million and a catastrophic \$1.3 billion. If the \$500 million cost of advancing the F5 Freeway is excluded, the figure will only be \$800 million! But that is not the end. Unfortunately, not all the State costs are included in the amounts referred to in the *Sydney Morning Herald* articles. What about the costs of compensating schools, hospitals and other institutions under the flight path for soundproofing? The costings for the third runway do not include those figures and the New South Wales taxpayer will have to shoulder those costs.

I have spoken on many occasions in this House on this issue and asked many questions but I have never received a satisfactory reply from the Minister for School Education. Clearly enormous expenditure will be required by many schools - private and public - hospitals, the University of Sydney and other institutions situated under the flight path on some level of soundproofing. The Federal Government will not pay for that. It will be borne by individual schools and ultimately by the students who will have to pay incredibly high fees. Those schools that cannot afford soundproofing will suffer as a result. That hidden cost has been drawn to the attention of this Government, but it has chosen to ignore it. No provision has been made for compensation to residents who will be affected by noise. These externalities - as they are called - are never taken into consideration by major developers, including the FAC. It is about time the Federal and State governments recognised that major project costings, including the third runway, should include compensation to residents who will be disturbed significantly.

I am concerned also about the one-off loss to the State of significant fishing resources associated with Botany Bay. Again, costings of this kind have not been included. The New South Wales Government will have to compensate those affected in the fishing industry. Compensation to oyster farmers at Botany Bay has not been included. Will those businesses just go down the drain? I understood this Government was in favour of private enterprise and would be in favour of compensating oyster farmers, yet no assistance has been forthcoming. This is not a one-off loss; it will be a permanent and significant loss to our State's fishing resource. I am astounded that the State Government would accept a measly \$5.4 million for the land that will be dredged when it has been estimated that it could be worth up to \$57 million. Putting that aside, who will pay for the remediation costs of heavy metals such as mercury that will be unleashed in the bay and on the environment when this sand is dredged. That is another cost that has not been taken into consideration. Recently when the Penrhyn Estuary in Botany Bay was being dredged, the Environment Protection Authority had to disallow that dredging because of the toxic and heavy metals that were being unleashed. Fortunately

Page 6896

the Environment Protection Authority had jurisdiction at that time. In its eagerness to get the third runway under way at all costs the Government introduced State Environmental Planning Policy 31 which prevents the EPA having any jurisdiction over the impact of the dredging. Current State laws and guidelines drawn up by the EPA to ensure our environment is protected will have no status whatever in relation to the environment of Botany Bay and the third runway. It is an utter disgrace that the

Government has relinquished the rights of the people of this State to allow the FAC to violate the environment of Botany Bay. [*Time expired.*]

Mr YABSLEY (Vaucluse) [5.20]: It is difficult to imagine a more puerile and circuitous debate over the past 20 years than that involving a third runway for Sydney (Kingsford-Smith) Airport. When I was Minister for State Development and Minister for Tourism I had the opportunity to confirm some obvious points in relation to the third runway that were perhaps best summed up in a statement released by me on 2nd December, 1991. The statement was headed "Third Runway Debate has gone on long enough. Let's get on with it". As the Minister for Transport said, the third runway project should have gone ahead 15 years ago. The anti-third runway debate is being driven by people who are fundamentally anti-growth, anti-development and anti-profit. They are the foundation members of the flat earth society who would be happy to see this nation mark time and slip further and further behind, as the tigers of the Asian region run rings around us in terms of productivity, efficiency and economic growth.

Let there be no mistake: if we do not get on with building the third runway, we will become the second-rate nation of the Asia-Pacific region. Those who oppose this project are negative and would see this nation stagnate. The world is experiencing rapid political and economic change. The changing international environment has significant implications for Australia and New South Wales. The figures in relation to tourism are available for everyone to see, but in many respects they represent only the tip of the iceberg. I recall being in T'aipei 12 months ago with the Director-General of the Department of State Development, who is sitting in the adviser's seat at this very moment. During the course of that visit the comment was made about an occasion when the head of the major firm Evergreen, based in T'aipei, was looking at investment opportunities -

Mr J. H. Murray: On a point of order. During my contribution, when I sought to refer to an overseas example, a point of order was taken against me and I was not permitted to continue. The Speaker ruled that honourable members should refer only to infrastructure in New South Wales.

Madam DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order! I will allow the honourable member for Vaucluse to continue a little further. I have not really heard the thrust of his argument or how it pertains to the debate. If in fact it does relate to the infrastructure issue at hand, I should be happy to hear it.

Mr YABSLEY: The point is very simple: the honourable member for Drummoyne can try for all he is worth to use up my time, but the fact of the matter is that when a senior representative of Evergreen was sent to Australia in 1981 he was supposed to arrive in Sydney but the plane was diverted to Melbourne. Having arrived in Melbourne he was confronted with industrial action. He returned to T'aipei from Melbourne without having visited Sydney, stating that so far as investment in Australia was concerned, that was it. The plane did not land in Sydney; there was too much congestion at Sydney airport. The honourable member for Port Stephens and other members opposite can talk for all they are worth about the fishing industry in Botany Bay
Page 6897

and the oyster leases - the Government has great respect for those who toil and make an honest and decent living from those industries - but the fact is we are talking about nickels and dimes compared with the billions of dollars that will be invested in Australia when the third runway is built. There is an attempt by the foundation members of the flat earth society to divert this debate and stall the construction of the third runway. Unfortunately some well-meaning people who have been caught up with them are

protesting on fairly dubious environmental grounds. They lack credibility - [*Time expired.*]

Mr J. H. MURRAY (Drummoyne) [5.25], in reply: At the outset I make it quite clear that the State Australian Labor Party is at odds with the Federal Australian Labor Party on this issue. We do not believe there is a need for the third runway; we believe there is a need to locate a second airport at Badgerys Creek. The Minister for State Development in his 15-minute speech attempted to suggest that the documents in the possession of the Opposition are out of date. They are not out of date. In a letter dated 6th July, Mr Burchmore of the Division of Fisheries informed the Deputy Director of Fisheries and Mr Omma-Machio from the Department of Planning that there were problems, especially with the environmental impact statement and costings. The Department of Planning will refuse to provide additional income for the runway. The Maritime Services Board will do the same. The Division of Fisheries has advised that it will be following suit. The document suggests collusion between the three departments. They are at odds with what two present Ministers and one former Minister have put forward in this debate.

These particular departmental officials know full well that the costings they put forward are factual and that the taxpayer will bear the burden of these additional costs. The officials are trying to protect their own hides in these memorandums. Another document dated 13th September from the Division of Fisheries provided advice from the principal fisheries manager in relation to the third runway. The division considers the lead time inadequate for carrying out base line research on habitat and restocking needs. It suggests that the FAC must be responsible for the losses sustained and not defer research because the limitations put on research by the department would prevent the emergence of any reasonable results. The division advised the Department of Planning that more time was needed and that it could not monitor the habitat and develop the criteria and a definition within the limited period. That did not happen, and as a consequence the New South Wales taxpayer will have to pick up the tab for any damages that have been occasioned by this particular proposal. I remind honourable members of the difficulties experienced by the oyster growers in the Georges River when there was an oil spill in Botany Bay four or five years ago. That court case has just concluded. Approximately \$3 million was received in compensation. The oyster growers represent only one small section of the fishing industry. New South Wales taxpayers face potential costs as the Federal Government will not meet those costs. I want to allude also to the sale of Maritime Services Board land.

The honourable member for Murrumbidgee might be a cocky down the coast somewhere but we will not feed him. He should listen to what I am saying. The Maritime Services Board has given a \$400 million block of land to the Federal Government for \$1. What is the rationale for that? The rationale is that if New South Wales charged the Commonwealth the full cost, there would be repercussions under the relevant Act. What hypocrisy! During question time yesterday I listened for 25 minutes while the Premier and the Minister for Health complained about the Federal Government short-changing this State by \$90 million for health services. Despite that, the Chief Secretary, and Minister for Administrative Services, without blinking an eyelid, said that we have just given the Federal Government \$400 million. The charge was \$1.

Page 6898

Opposition members could not believe it. To compound the felony, the Minister for Transport said that New South Wales will be given first offer if the land is made available for purchase. If the land is to be sold, the Federal Government will allow New South Wales to buy it back at market-value, and New South Wales will get the first offer of purchase. If that is not the biggest bum deal I have ever heard of in my life, I should not

be in this Parliament.

The Minister for Transport has said that the people of New South Wales will not incur additional costs. He said it is all forgone cost. There will be no additional costs, but, by the same token, there will be no income from the land that we give to the Federal Government for the runway. We will give them the land for \$1. New South Wales will get \$4 million or \$5 million instead of \$400 million, but honourable members are told that that is income forgone and we should not worry about it. I have listened to treasurer after treasurer in this House talk about accrual accounting and about how this Government is leading the world - not just Australia - in accrual accounting. We have new budget documents with income on one side and expenditure on the other. A cost must be assigned to assets, whether or not they are income producing. However, the first time there is a chance for this Government to practise accrual accounting, it is thrown out the window. The Minister said that we should look at only one side of the Budget and that forgone moneys are not taken into account. Such costs are counted elsewhere in the Budget, but not here.

It was interesting that the Minister for Transport did not mention the F5. The reason for that is that it is a \$500 million hole that he was trying to sell to the Federal Government as part of this cost. He cannot have it both ways. The environmental impact statement for the Kinhill third runway stated that the Federal Airports Corporation is seeking agreement with the Roads and Traffic Authority to share the cost of the road, including the F5. That means that, even though the total transport strategy study for that area has been set up at considerable public expense, the Government is already planning to extend the F5 through the Wollie Creek area with Federal funding. The Federal funding was to come from moneys for the airport. Between April 1990 and June 1992 the Minister for Roads and the Roads and Traffic Authority, together with the Community Advisory Committee, which includes representation from the friends of Wollie Creek, conducted a Botany west transport study with the knowledge and concurrence of the Minister for Transport in order to determine transport needs for the region until 2010. At the same time that that was happening the Minister's department was secretly trying to screw the Federal Government for \$500 million to build the F5 through Wollie Creek, and that is why he did not mention it here. That is why the Minister did not say the \$500 million would be included in the costing for the roads. He cannot have it both ways. He cannot say to the Federal Government that he wants the money for one purpose but deny it in this place.

Any businessman who travels the world must use airports that are located a similar distance from the central business district as Badgerys Creek is from the Sydney central business district. That is the case at Narita in Tokyo, at the Charles de Gaulle Airport in Paris, John Foster Dulles in Washington or Heathrow in London. Businessmen accept that situation, yet the rationale in this debate is that we must spend the money because business people in Sydney cannot be expected to travel to Badgerys Creek. What utter rubbish! Overseas businessmen do it and when New South Wales businessmen travel overseas they must do exactly the same thing. There is no economic rationale for the argument.

Motion agreed to.

Page 6899

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

DEATH OF Mr JOHN ALISON

Mr BLACKMORE (Maitland) [5.36]: On 26th August a great citizen of the township of Dungog died, that is, Robert John Alison, C.M.G. He was born in Dungog on 9th July, 1910. His earlier education was conducted at the Dungog primary school. He later went to East Maitland Boys High School and was educated to leaving certificate standard at Trinity College at Strathfield. He represented Trinity in rugby union. After leaving school he returned to Dungog where he assisted his father, Robert Alison, on the land with grazing and dairying interests. As a young man his sporting interests included polo and he became one of the State's leading polo players and a champion at tent pegging. In 1932 he was a member of the Hunter River Lancers team that defeated the 12th Light Horse polo team at Tamworth. That was the first occasion on which army polo had been played in Australia. In 1937 he represented New South Wales at polo, playing in the Philippines. Prior to the war he was commanding officer of C Squadron, 16th Light Horse Regiment. In 1941 he commenced full-time service in the 16th Motor Regiment. With the rank of major he joined the 2/16 Infantry Battalion as officer in charge of C Company when he was involved in active service in the Markham-Ramu Valley campaign and also the Shaggy Ridge campaign in New Guinea. He was transferred to the 2/1 Pioneers as second in command and saw action in Borneo with the 7th Division.

During war service John Alison met his wife, Mary Chandler, who was nursing in the Australian Medical Women's Army Service. After their marriage they returned to Dungog where he resumed his career on the land. He became a foundation member of the Dungog Returned Soldiers League, and in 1946 he was elected to the Dungog War Memorial Committee. As a senior ranking army officer in the district he was officer in command of the annual ANZAC Day commemoration services up to the time of his passing. He was a member of Dungog Legacy and was president of that branch until March this year. He had the unique honour of being the only person to be made a patron of the Hunter Legacy group that included Maitland, Kurri Kurri and Cessnock. John Alison was a member of the Dungog Agricultural and Horticultural Association and was elected to the committee in 1931. He served for several years as president of the show society and for many years he served as the chief steward of the dairy cattle section. He served as a steward in the cattle section of the Royal Agricultural Society in Sydney for more than 20 years.

The late John Alison was a leader during his war service and he was equally a leader to the many groups and associations with which he was associated. His interest in rural affairs covered a wide field including the co-operative movement. He became a director of the Dairy Farmers Co-operative in Sydney in 1946 following the death of his father. He was elected deputy chairman in 1953 and chairman in 1962, a position he held until his retirement in 1980. He was also chairman of the nine wholly owned subsidiaries, four of which were also co-operatives. In 1963, he became a director of the State and Federal boards of the Co-operative Insurance Company of Australia Limited and was elected Chairman of the State board of the Co-operative Insurance Company Limited in 1967 and its Federal board in 1973. In 1968 he was appointed a member of the Dairy Industry Advisory Council by the New South Wales Government to carry out an investigation into the structure of the dairy industry in New South Wales with particular reference to the marketing of liquid whole milk and the production and marketing of manufactured dairy products.

which later became the National Party. His association with the Country Party-National Party covered a period of 50 years, an association he maintained until his death. He was instrumental in organising the nomination and ultimate election of the late the Hon. Leon Punch and he always maintained a close association with the parliamentary and executive members of the National Party. It is so pleasing to see Madam Deputy Speaker in the chair this evening. Her electorate covered the area of Dungog. She spent a number of nights and evenings with the Alisons and was very fond of the family. John Alison had a lifetime association with the Anglican Church in the district. Being a regular communicant he served as a rector's warden, parochial councillor and synod representative to the diocese of Newcastle.

His younger son Ranald is also well known to the honourable member for Gordon, who is in the Chamber today. Another son, Robert, is the Usher of the Black Rod in the Senate in Canberra. John and Mary Alison raised a family of five sons at their home "Nulla Nulla", situated on the northern perimeter of the Dungog township, the home established by John's late father, Robert W. Alison. The magnitude of the final tribute from the citizens of the town and district and beyond was a testament to the great service that John Alison gave to the community during his lifetime. The community of Dungog has suffered a great loss through his passing. It is with great pleasure this evening that I call upon this House to pay tribute to a great citizen of a great family, a person who cared so much for the well-being of others in the township of Dungog.

PROPOSED HELIPAD AT KOGARAH

Mr LANGTON (Kogarah) [5.41]: I raise a matter of great contention that has caused grave concern to my constituents - the proposal by the Southern Sydney Area Health Service and St George Hospital to construct a helipad on the roof of the newly constructed car park on the corner of Short and Gray Streets at Kogarah. One of the major problems has been a lack of consultation with residents by the area health service and the hospital on one hand and by Kogarah council on the other. I am aware that Kogarah council considered the matter on 17th August, at which time it resolved, *inter alia*, that the matter be deferred and:

FURTHER, that all affected residents, schools and businesses be involved closely in the consultations.

FURTHER, that following these consultations a report be brought forward to Council.

The residents did not receive a letter from the council about this matter until 14th September and submissions closed on 16th September. In other words residents have not had an opportunity to have a genuine input into this helipad application. The area health service has completely failed to consult with any of the affected groups in the Kogarah area, and I can state quite categorically that at no stage has anybody from the area health service, the Department of Health or the St George Hospital approached me by phone, in person or by writing to mention the construction of a helipad on the roof of this car park. It is obvious that when the car park was originally constructed it was always intended that there would be a helipad on the roof. No mention was made of that helipad by the area health service or the hospital at the time of the car park's construction and I believe that by failing to advise the council, the residents and the local member, the area health service has been grossly deficient in its duty. On 17th August the council resolved:

FURTHER, that all affected residents, schools and businesses be involved closely in the consultations.

Page 6901

But I can assure all honourable members that Miss Pam Fitzpatrick, the principal of St Patrick's primary school at Kogarah - the school that would be most affected - has not been consulted at any time by the council, the health service or the hospital. There are many problems associated with the helipad and I am not asking that it not go ahead. But I would ask that the Minister for Health intervene now that the council has approved the application by a six to five vote, which reversed an earlier six to five vote to defer the application, to ensure there is genuine consultation with the council, the residents, the local member, and principals of the three schools and their 800 pupils who will be directly affected by the flight path, I hope those consultations lead to a resolution that will satisfy the needs of the hospital, the area health service, the council and the local residents.

I refer briefly to a number of issues raised by my constituents in their case against the siting of the helipad. There is no doubt that helicopter mishaps have occurred. There is no factor for error at the proposed site on the roof of the car park. Royal North Shore Hospital and Prince Henry Hospital have a factor for error, but there is no margin for error when landing on a helipad in the middle of a residential area. The helipad is a relatively low site in an area of home units and schools. The problems are enormous. If the helipad is approved, it will be a public helipad and therefore can be used by the Premier, a Minister visiting the area, or a television news helicopter. The people of Kogarah should not be subjected to that. No environmental or pollution study has been undertaken and no consideration has been given to the great concerns of the residents about noise and safety. [*Time expired.*]

PRESERVATION OF FLORA AND FAUNA

Mr CHAPPELL (Northern Tablelands) [5.46]: Some weeks ago I was contacted by Kath Wray of Armidale, representing a community group called Citizens Wildlife Corridors, to discuss the group's proposed projects. I raise the matter today because the project is, in my opinion, a most worthwhile effort to introduce an extra dimension into the rehabilitation of the environment and particularly our native fauna. As such, it is worthy of support in the community, and I do not mean just in the Armidale community but throughout all of our local communities by many local government councils and by this State Government. I hope honourable members will give the proposal the consideration it deserves to see if, in their own electorates, they might be able to encourage the adoption of similar schemes or perhaps a different rate and standard of development of our countryside so that throughout the whole of the State the damage done to native flora and fauna over many years can be repaired. The development has been good for us in the short term but not so good for our native plants and animals. Honourable members should consider this project and decide whether they can make a contribution. The details of the proposal are fairly simple. It relates to a lot of schemes that have been implemented in various localities - trees on farms, replanting schemes and so forth. It recognises that there needs to be an interlinking of many of these areas, the development of corridors as the name suggests, so that wildlife can move about freely. It is a further extension of the replanting that is occurring in so many areas throughout New South Wales, by organisations such as Greening Australia, which are doing excellent work - perhaps no more successfully than in the Armidale area.

A mosaic of wildlife corridors must be developed to link watering holes, breeding habitats and foodstuffs from different trees and shrubs - all native species that can be replanted. This will involve co-ordinating a lot of good work that has already

been done by a number of people. The gaps in the middle of these areas should be taken up by landowners and others who are responsible for public lands, such as the local
Page 6902

Department of Conservation and Land Management or the National Parks and Wildlife Service, to ensure continuous corridors across any locality. As I have said, the provision of food, cover, water and breeding areas will enable the dispersal of diverse genetic material and will play a significant role in rehabilitating much of our native wildlife and, in particular, our birdlife. This idea which has come to light obviously has some implications that the Government and local government need to think about. If there is to be a network of wildlife refuges, councils would have to forgo possible rate revenue because some productive farming land along a fence line or adjacent to a road would have to be given up from productive use. Clearly, local government councils would not willingly give up - and nor should they - their rate revenue from that source. By the same token, because of the time and energy that will be put into this, many of those aspects may be able to be covered, without great expense, at local council level.

The matter I have raised today is very valid. It is an extension of the good work that has already been done in many areas. The creation of wildlife corridors needs to be thought through. In the Armidale area it has attracted a great deal of support from a number of people - broadacre farmers, graziers, hobby farmers, people living on the fringes of the town and even people living in town who want linkages with public areas throughout Armidale. This proposal represents broad community thinking. Honourable members, who have responsibility for local areas in their own electorates, should think about adopting such a scheme. I raise this matter for that purpose today. I have raised with the Minister for Local Government, and Minister for Cooperatives the question of rate revenue. The Minister for the Environment and all honourable members should consider the suggestion to see whether they can play a part in such a worthy project.
[Time expired.]

Mrs COHEN (Badgerys Creek - Chief Secretary, and Minister for Administrative Services) [5.51]: The project raised by the honourable member for Northern Tablelands sounds sensible. I undertake to refer it to the relevant Ministers.

IMPORTATION OF SEAWEED

Mr MOSS (Canterbury) [5.53]: Mr Max Lowe, an importer of Asian groceries in my electorate, is experiencing difficulties in importing seaweed, particularly with respect to the manner in which the Department of Health checks and analyses the product. Seaweed is a popular product sold in shops in the Canterbury electorate. When seaweed is brought into this country it has to go through the Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service. I imagine all foodstuffs undergo scrutiny by that service. The quarantine service takes random samples from various batches of seaweed and those samples are analysed by the Australian Government Analytical Laboratories. I am told that about 20 per cent of the time the product is rejected for having high levels of arsenic and or cadmium. Naturally, any seaweed with levels over the limit is destroyed. When this occurs the supplier not only loses out on the value of the stock; he loses out also on the prepaid import duty on seaweed that is destroyed and has to pay for the tests carried out by the Australian Government Analytical Laboratories, so he is disadvantaged.

Mr Lowe accepts all this. However, the problem he faces is that the New South Wales Department of Health also has authority to check seaweed and does so after it has been released from quarantine. This often occurs when departmental inspectors visit retail outlets. Therefore, more seaweed is likely to be confiscated because random tests are conducted, initially only by the Australian Government Analytical Laboratories, then

batches of seaweed released on the market can also be found by the Department of Health to have high levels of arsenic and or cadmium. So the problem faced by Mr Lowe is not Page 6903

knowing how much seaweed is left, despite the fact that it has already gone through quarantine and Federal Government tests. Mr Lowe believes that a way to overcome this duplication of inspections is for officers from the Department of Health to analyse the goods at the point of entry, together with the Australian Government Analytical Laboratories. Alternatively, the Department of Health should bow out of this procedure altogether but, as a compromise for abandoning this procedure, more random tests could be conducted and more random samples taken by the Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service when seaweed is initially imported.

It could be argued that the onus is on an importer to ensure that goods come within Australian standards before shipment. I point out that in the case of seaweed it is impossible to check all shipments before they come into the country. Seaweed has to be crushed so that tests can be carried out. If it is crushed, it is destroyed and is no longer a saleable item. We have a catch-22 situation. If all seaweed were to be checked for arsenic and or cadmium, there would be none to sell. On behalf of Mr Lowe, I ask the Minister to look closely at this issue with a view to ensuring that, in the future, Department of Health officers are available, along with Federal authorities, to check the seaweed on its arrival in Australia. Alternatively, the Department of Health should not check seaweed in the future and the Federal Government should conduct more tests, which would solve the problem.

HORNSBY RIFLE RANGE

Mr O'DOHERTY (Ku-ring-gai) [5.58]: I raise a matter of concern for many of my constituents, particularly those who live around Hornsby rifle range. Hornsby rifle range is in an area of my electorate that has bushland around it, but it is also bounded by many residential areas. Nice homes they are too, with good neighbours. Tonight I ask whether Hornsby rifle range is a good neighbour within my electorate. Some of the occurrences over the past few years would tend to indicate otherwise. Residents have been concerned for some years about the noise from the Hornsby rifle range. One could always argue that the rifle range was there before many of them built their homes. That would be a pretty fair argument. I would not suggest for one moment that shooters do not have the right to pursue their sport in an area that has been designated as a rifle range. However, I ask whether or not they should be subjected to the same laws, in particular noise pollution laws, as the rest of society.

In 1978 the rifle range submitted a development application. It is my understanding that even now it has not met the levels for noise barriers required under that development application approved by Hornsby council in 1978. In 1987 another development application was submitted which involved extending the length of the rifle range. That work has been completed. It has allowed for the use of even larger bore rifles, making even more noise. I understand that under that development application further noise barriers are required. Those noise barriers again have not been included in the work carried out to date. The Hornsby rifle range where the shots are fired is close to the Mount Wilga rehabilitation centre. Residents of that centre are entitled to a special barrier but the council is yet to convince the rifle range to build that barrier. What about the laws of New South Wales and the Environment Protection Authority? It is a good question.

I raised that matter with the Minister for the Environment on behalf of my constituents. The Environment Protection Authority replied that because the Hornsby

rifle range was created by and is controlled by Commonwealth legislation and administered by the Department of Defence, it is completely outside the control of the
Page 6904

New South Wales authority. In other words, the rifle range can make more noise at any time than anybody else because it comes under Federal jurisdiction. Whether that is the case or not, it seems that members of the community should act under the laws and standards set by and for that community. My constituents should be able to expect noise at appropriate times as deemed by State legislation and at appropriate levels such as the laws to which the constituents are subject. In 1989 the former State Pollution Control Commission was confronted with this very question. At that time the commission thought it would be possible to control the noise. Tests were carried out. A section 45 notice served under the Noise Control Act sought to limit the times that the rifle range operated. Those times are not in any way onerous. That notice was not complied with. Further tests were conducted in 1990 and over a one-hour period about 350 shots were tested, of which 54 were above 100 decibels in noise level. This is considered to be a fairly high level of noise - higher than that made by jackhammers at a distance of one metre.

My constituents who live near the rifle range were subjected, in that one-hour period, to 54 sound events that were greater than being one metre away from a jackhammer. This noise occurs most weekends of the year and sometimes at night as well. I ask the Minister for the Environment to raise this matter again with the Federal Government. I ask the people who operate the rifle range to be good neighbours, to operate within the proper hours and within the proper laws as determined by the State authorities, even though it is within Federal jurisdiction. I also ask that the building of the barriers continue as a matter of urgency. These barriers were required by the Hornsby Shire Council as long ago as 1978. I thank Mr Phillip Neill and his wife for raising this matter with me. I visited the Neill family last weekend. I am convinced this problem has a significant impact on the quality of their family life, living with the noise and never knowing from weekend to weekend whether it will be noisy or quiet.

SALE OF CARDIFF PROPERTY OF Mr WHITING

Mr MILLS (Wallsend) [6.3]: I wish to raise a most unfortunate case involving Mr Raymond Whiting, one of my constituents, of Wallsend Road, Cardiff. In June 1991 Mr Whiting commenced arrangements to purchase a property in Queensland, subject to the sale of his residential property in Cardiff. He instructed Mr Peter McNamara of First National Real Estate, Elermore Vale to offer his Cardiff property for sale by auction. The auction on 29th June, 1991, failed to attract a buyer. The agent advised that an investor friend may be interested in the property. Mr Whiting signed an agreement appointing Mr McNamara as sole agent for 90 days from the auction. About a month later my constituent was introduced to the investor, a Mr Ken Mearns, managing director of Fatabi Pty Limited. An offer of \$183,500 was accepted by my constituent. Mr Mearns requested permission to occupy after the expiration of the seven-day cooling off period. The agent assured my constituent that he would be fully protected by a licence to occupy. This licence to occupy is the point of my private member's statement this evening. Under the terms of that licence the buyer would pay \$200 per week rental, to be paid on settlement.

The contract was signed and exchanged on 1st August, 1991. Events took a bad turn. The agent advised my constituent that there was no money to pay the deposit on that day. Seven days later, on 8th August, 1991, the agent advised my constituent that the deposit had been received. He refused my constituent's request for a copy of the receipt, but did provide his assurance that everything was in order. My constituent

vacated his house on 9th August. He was assured by both agent and purchaser that settlement would take place on 12th August. My constituent moved to Queensland on 9th August, stored his furniture and awaited settlement. A week later no settlement had been

Page 6905

made. My constituent contacted the agent who said, "Sorry, any day now". Another week, no word on settlement. The agent advised my constituent that the buyer had 42 days in which to settle. Weekly calls were made to the agent. The conveyancing agent was blamed for the delay; the buyer's solicitors were blamed for the delay. Seven days after the expiry of the 42 days' settlement period my constituent issued a 14-day notice to complete settlement, together with a seven-day notice to vacate the Cardiff property, in accordance with the licence to occupy.

At the end of the 14-day notice the conveyancer was advised there was no money available for settlement. The agent advised and guaranteed my constituent that settlement would be made inside seven days, otherwise the buyer would vacate. Things went from bad to worse. The Elermore Vale agent made an offer to the agent in Queensland for the property transaction there. The offer was that in return for a further 21-day extension \$11,500 would be paid each to my constituent and to the Queensland vendor to compensate for the delay. On 11th October, 1991, my constituent terminated his conveyancer's services, paid out \$800 and consulted a solicitor. On two occasions the agent advised the solicitor that the buyer would pay \$1,000 per day until settlement in return for an extension of time. The solicitor submitted a deed of variation of the sale agreement in return for further delay. The buyer refused to sign. My constituent returned from Queensland and boarded with relatives in the Hunter. Honourable members can imagine the stress and impact on his health while his house was occupied in breach of the contract.

Finally, my constituent instructed a solicitor and legal action commenced on 15th November. The court hearing could not be held in Newcastle but had to be held in Sydney before the Supreme Court, barristers and all. The matter was referred by my constituent to the Real Estate Services Council for investigation in January 1992. On 11th January, 1992, the Supreme Court ordered in favour of my constituent for a termination of the contract, return of the deposit, payment of \$6,600 rent under the licence to occupy, and court costs to be paid by the defendant. On 21st February the buyer was finally evicted by the sheriff. The principal real estate firm returned the deposit, which my constituent urgently needed to pay his legal costs of nearly \$16,000. The licence to occupy is a good feature of conveyancing law but only if all goes well. If the vendor's agent acts in the interests of the buyer and the buyer is unscrupulous, there is enormous cost in time and money and disruption to the vendor. Sooner or later the Government needs to consider streamlining the process of recovering property when a buyer occupying a property under licence defaults. The licence to occupy does not protect the vendor. I would request the Minister for Housing to have this question reviewed.

BECKOM CROWN LAND RELEASE

Mr CRUICKSHANK (Murrumbidgee) [6.8]: I wish to raise a matter which has been festering for quite some time concerning the ability of people wishing to settle in small country towns to purchase Crown land. If constituents come into remote areas, we love to grab them with both arms, but there are unfortunately a few inhibitions to the way they can go about buying Crown land. I want to refer in particular to two cases. Mr and Mrs Jackson rent a house in Beckom. Beckom is not exactly a metropolis; it is a small town between Ardlethan and Aria Park. It is a lovely little town on a bit of a flood plain, with beautiful gum trees. These people are New Zealanders and both are

teachers. They wish to reside in Beckom. Plenty of Crown land blocks are available. They have been surveyed and have to be sold by the Coolamon Shire Council for rates. A letter written by the Department of Lands to the Jacksons on 18th May this year states:

Page 6906

If you wish for us to proceed in say, 12 months time, it will be necessary for you to lodge the attached application form accompanied by a deposit towards costs of \$400.00. As we proceed with consideration of selling the land you may be asked to lodge further amounts towards the costs of the investigation. Some of these costs will include advertising twice (\$295.00), valuation (at least \$150.00), and of course the land value itself.

Those costs total between \$850 and \$1,000. I rang the shire clerk at Coolamon and asked him the value of the land. He told me that it might be worth \$100 a block, or \$150 a block if one were lucky. Government costs to get the land to public auction will be between \$850 and \$1,000 and the purchaser will pay between \$100 and \$150, or perhaps a top price of \$200, a block. I find this most aggravating. Why is it necessary to have a valuation, for a start? Why is it necessary to have costs of that amount? Why does the land have to be advertised twice? These blocks have been sitting there for the last 100 years and never been built on. All of a sudden the bureaucracy says that these costs must be met and these steps taken if anyone wants to buy the blocks of land. It is not good enough. People in the cities complain about all kinds of problems. If they go to Beckom they will have no problems, but unfortunately the long arm of bureaucracy will follow them. Council suggests that it will take 12 months before the land can be sold. My advice is that it will be two years before it will be possible to bid for the blocks.

Mr Downy: It could be three or four years.

Mr CRUICKSHANK: That is right. I have heard similar stories on many occasions. I wish the message to be conveyed to the Minister that something must be done about this, not only in regard to Beckom but throughout New South Wales. Every small town has a massive number of small blocks of land. In the Griffith area there are even reserve Crown lands for universities. Crown land has been set aside for all kinds of things, most of which have been superseded. Nevertheless the bureaucracy insists that the land remain in case it might be needed at some time in the future. Most of us realise that is a lot of nonsense. The other block of land about which I am concerned is on the Beelbangera Road north of Griffith. The property is called "The Hospital Farm" and is of about 1,800 acres. Since World War II that land has been leased by the Crown to various people for the grazing of sheep. Irrigation land has come closer to the site and at last it is possible to sell the land, subdivide it with drip irrigation, and it will become valuable irrigation land. The Crown does not want the land but unfortunately nothing can be done for about four years. The land will not be available for between two years and four years. That should not happen. The Crown does not have the right to prevent people from purchasing much-needed land in country areas for development. I ask that the Minister apply his minders to this problem and find a way to make it possible for people to buy vacant Crown land. [*Time expired.*]

TOW TRUCK LICENCE CHARGES

Mr CRITTENDEN (Wyang) [6.13]: I raise a matter of concern to a man in my electorate, Mr John Matts, who operates a smash repair business in Berkeley Vale. However, in order to operate his business he must run a tow truck. In 1990 the licensing fee he had to pay as part of his business was \$32; in 1991 it increased to \$650; and in 1992 it went to \$900. From 1990 to 1991 the fee increased 2031 per cent; from

1991 to 1992 the increase was 138 per cent; and from 1990 to 1992 the overall increase was 2812.5 per cent. That is nothing short of astounding for someone who is attempting to operate a small family business. Mr Matts must have his licence because most of his business comes from clients who have dealt with him in the past. If they have an accident in their vehicles, they want him to go to the scene of the accident and collect the
Page 6907

vehicle. To enable him to continue with his business he has no choice but to operate a tow truck. However, he is not pleased about having to pay the fees involved. I wrote to the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works, and Minister for Roads, who has responsibility for this type of matter. In his reply to me he finally got to the issue in paragraph six of his letter, where he said that under the Tow Truck Act of 1989 the tow Truck Industry Council established under the Act sets the licence fees.

The Deputy Premier virtually wiped his hands of the matter and said he had had enough. In his reply the Minister said that the fee for 1990-91 comprised a \$500 base element, plus \$150 for each truck undertaking all forms of towing work. Mr Matts has only one truck. Any small business with one truck is disadvantaged compared to the larger firms with a number of trucks. That puts paid to the myth that this Government is concerned about small business. Members of the Liberal Party only offer platitudes in that regard, but National Party members have never indulged in that sort of hypocrisy. The Deputy Premier's reply was carefully worded. He said that in reviewing the fees for the 1991-92 year, the increase was \$250. That is outrageous in anyone's language. Never let it be said that the National Party does not look after its friends. In 1991 a concession reduced the base element for country operators to \$250 and the trucking fee to \$150.

People on the Central Coast do not consider that they live in a metropolitan area. The Central Coast might be located between Sydney and Newcastle, but people who live there do not regard themselves as being part of any metropolitan region. The sad reality is that the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works, and Minister for Roads has abrogated his responsibility and passed it on to private enterprise, which will fail dismally. Massive increases in costs have been passed on to the consumers. The most recent report from the Tow Truck Industry Council of New South Wales, the annual report for 1990-91 includes an income and expenditure statement for the year ended 30th June, 1991. That shows that employee related expenses were \$525,000; consultants expenses were \$151,000, including \$31,500 for research into the introduction of a work allocation scheme. Maintenance and working expenses were \$256,000. Why was that amount spent? I know that the Government Whip has raised this matter on a number of occasions. In terms of bipartisan support - [Time expired.]

SUTHERLAND RAILWAY STATION

BOOKING OFFICE

Mr DOWNY (Sutherland) [6.18]: I raise a matter that is of concern to me and to my constituents. It concerns Sutherland railway station. I take the opportunity of congratulating the Government on providing \$1.4 million for completion of the refurbishment of Sutherland station. That amount includes \$400,000 for the provision of an elevator to platforms two and three from the concourse area above. However, a problem has arisen. I was concerned to read in the *St George and Sutherland Shire Leader* last week about problems in regard to the location of the booking office. Last Thursday a meeting was held. This followed representations by the rail unions to State Rail regarding concerns about the safety of commuters because of the location of ticket-selling windows in the new station building on the concourse. The unions ask for safety reasons that two windows facing the street be relocated to face towards the

concourse area. Though the unions were consulted over the original station design, they were not consulted at a later date about changes to that design. As a result of last Thursday's meeting, according to the unions, little progress has been made. According to a further press statement in the *St George and Sutherland Shire Leader* on 13th October, a danger exists of vehicles involved in accidents mounting the footpath and crashing into people queuing for tickets. State Rail appears to have a different version of last Thursday's meeting.

Page 6908

I have lived in Sutherland since I was born 37 years ago and I cannot remember any serious accidents occurring on that footbridge which was constructed in 1940. The upgrading of the station has been costly and the problem should have been rectified at the beginning. The unions are justified in their concerns and I hope the matters are rectified. Last Thursday I caught the train from Sutherland to travel to Parliament and was annoyed to learn that the ticket barriers on the concourse were not being manned, the destination boards were locked, the concourse area was a pigsty and obviously had not been cleaned. Though the unions might have some justification for black banning the ticket-selling area, they are not justified in not manning ticket barriers. While reconstruction was taking place, complaints were received about tickets not being collected, and I have spoken to the Minister about this matter previously. This brand new station is filthy. I ask that the ticket-selling window issue be resolved quickly and that the Minister instruct CityRail to ensure the area is cleaned to enable commuters to be proud of Sutherland station. Ticket barriers should be manned and destination boards utilised so that commuters may be informed of train timetables before reaching the platform.

Mr BAIRD (Northcott - Minister for Transport, and Minister for Tourism) [6.23]: The honourable member for Sutherland has pushed hard for the redevelopment of Sutherland railway station. This first rate facility has cost large sums of money and is to have a bus-rail interchange built. His comments about lack of ticket collection, indicator boards not being utilised, objections by the union to the location of ticket windows and so on are of concern. It is important that staff co-operate to ensure that all facilities are user friendly and that this is an effective and impressive passenger State Rail Authority interface. I shall raise this matter with Mr John Brew, who is the new Chief Executive of State Rail. I shall request that a complete review of Sutherland station be undertaken on general cleanliness and staff concerns. This will enable this issue to be resolved promptly. As a result Sutherland station, a prime station in the network with a large number of commuters, will be restored to its full operational capacity.

AUBURN ELECTORATE ROAD IMPROVEMENTS

Mr NAGLE (Auburn) [6.25]: I raise a matter concerning a ringroad that runs through my electorate. It commences at North Silverwater Road, Ermington, and travels south to Victoria Road, where it meets up with Silverwater Road. It goes to Parramatta Road, St Hilliers Road through to Olympic Drive, Joseph Street to Rookwood Road and finishes at Bruncker Road and up to the Hume Highway. The road is intersected by the M4 Freeway, Parramatta Road, Bruncker Road and the Hume Highway. It bisects the electorate. This important road system is part of the Government's north-south system. North Silverwater Road is a dead end and has a large vacant block of land through to Victoria Road, where it meets up with Silverwater Road again. A deviation through the back streets of Ermington is necessary. There are no houses or pedestrians in North Silverwater Road yet there is a speed camera sign. I ask: how many accidents have precipitated the erection of a speed camera? This is a three-lane concrete road. It lends itself to speed, the obvious attraction for speed cameras, but what number of deaths and

accidents have occurred to cause that sign to be erected? Excessive speed makes this area excellent for revenue-raising but safety is not an issue.

I refer next to the beginning of St Hilliers Road from Parramatta Road to Olympic Drive. St Hilliers Road is a narrow, four-lane carriageway with a massive extension of another four lanes to the west on St Hilliers Road. In 1988 plans were in place for roadworks; in 1989 roadworks began; by 1990 pipes and foundations were laid; in 1991 nothing happened; in 1992 nothing has happened and I am told by way of a letter to Auburn Municipal Council that nothing will happen in 1993. Perhaps in 1994 that

Page 6909

extension will become a part of the ringroad. This is causing a problem to the quality of life of residents in units adjacent to the road. Also, it is causing traffic jams at the intersection of Parramatta Road for vehicles endeavouring to enter and exit the M4 Freeway. This has caused enormous problems in that area because many vehicles seek to exit the M4 to avoid toll booths west of Silverwater Road. Completion of the roadworks at St Hilliers Road would give four lanes in both directions, thus increasing traffic flow. This would increase to six lanes in Olympic Drive and Joseph Street, Rookwood, until the intersection of Bruncker Road and the Hume Highway.

At that intersection there is vacant land that once belonged to the father of the former Premier of New South Wales. That was sold off long ago and is now to be developed. Peak hour traffic is congested from the Hume Highway back to Rookwood Road because vehicles cannot make a left-hand turn to travel east towards Sydney. This has caused enormous problems. This ringroad system from North Silverwater Road through my electorate to the Hume Highway in the south is a mess created by this Government. Speed cameras have been put on Rookwood Road, though in seven years only one fatality has occurred and a couple of minor accidents. I ask the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works, and Minister for Roads to meet with representatives from Auburn Municipal Council to discuss this issue. Recently in a letter the Minister stated that the work may start in 1993-94. This matter is of grave importance to the people of my electorate and those who travel on that north-south ringroad and firm undertakings should be given by the Minister as to a completion date.

Private members' statements noted.

[Mr Acting-Speaker (Mr Chappell) left the chair at 6.30 p.m.. The House resumed at 7.30 p.m.]

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE UPON POLICE ADMINISTRATION

Message

Mr Acting-Speaker (Mr Hazzard) reported the receipt of the following message from the Legislative Council:

Mr Speaker

The Legislative Council having had under consideration the Legislative Assembly's Message of 14th October, 1992, desires to inform the Legislative Assembly that it has this day agreed to the following Resolution:

- (1) That a Joint Select Committee be appointed to inquire into whether mechanisms of accountability, the existing roles of and reporting relationships between the Minister for Police, the Police Board of New South Wales, the Inspector General of Police and the

Commissioner of Police are adequate to ensure an efficient, effective and accountable Police Service in New South Wales and may make such recommendations for reform as it considers desirable.

- (2) In conducting the Inquiry:
 - (a) the committee shall have regard to the circumstances which resulted in the resignation of the Honourable E.P. Pickering, M.L.C. as Minister for Police and Emergency Services; and
 - (b) the committee shall not duplicate the examination by the Ombudsman of the matters outlined in the Report by the Ombudsman to the Parliament of 29th September, 1992 about the complaints by Mrs Carolyn Rigg about the conduct of the New South Wales Police Service until such time as the Ombudsman's Report is completed.

Page 6910

- (3) That the committee shall consist of six Members of the Legislative Assembly and four Members of the Legislative Council.
- (4) That notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Standing Orders of either House:
 - (a) the Legislative Council Members shall be two Members supporting the Government and two Members not supporting the Government;
 - (b) Mr Egan, Mr Gay, Ms Kirkby, and Mr Mutch be appointed to serve on such committee as Members of the Legislative Council;
 - (c) Mr Gay be the Chairman of the Committee.
- (5) That at any meeting of the committee six Members shall constitute a quorum, provided that the committee shall meet as a joint committee at all times.
- (6) That the Chairman of the committee shall have a deliberative and casting vote.
- (7) That leave be given to Mr Pickering to appear and give evidence before the committee.
- (8) That the committee have leave to sit during the sittings or any adjournment of either or both Houses; to adjourn from place to place; to have power to take evidence and send for persons and papers; and to report from time to time.
- (9) That the committee make an interim report by 20th November, 1992.
- (10) That should either or both Houses stand adjourned and the committee agree to any report before the Houses resume sitting:
 - (a) the committee have leave to send any such report, minutes and evidence taken before it to the Clerk of the House;
 - (b) the documents shall be printed and published and the Clerk shall forthwith take such action as is necessary to give effect to the order of the House; and
 - (c) the documents shall be laid upon the Table of the House at its next sitting.

HUNTER WATER BOARD (CORPORATISATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Bill introduced and read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr COLLINS (Willoughby - Minister for State Development, and Minister for Arts) [7.32]: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

When the former Hunter Water Board was corporatised on 1st January, 1992, it was the first natural monopoly in Australia to take such a step. The enabling legislation, the Hunter Water Board (Corporatisation) Act 1991, provides a comprehensive range of instruments to ensure protection of consumer interests and the environment. It also provides a clearly defined framework to enhance the commercial efficiency of the organisation. The Hunter Water Corporation has been functioning effectively under the legislation for the last 10 months. Section 61 of the Act was intended to create a legal basis for the disposal of sludge from the Burwood Beach wastewater treatment facility

Page 6911

into an abandoned underground mine some 60 metres beneath the works surface. The disposal process was chosen after extensive independent research, and has the approval of all relevant government authorities. It is considered to be the most effective solution to the sludge disposal question at Burwood Beach, based on economic, environmental and social considerations.

Regular monitoring since the sludge disposal process commenced on 15th July has revealed no problems. Conditions in the mine are behaving just as predicted. The stringent independent monitoring and testing program will continue over the two year provisional period of the disposal process and for at least five years after the cessation of the process. An independent committee comprising representatives of government departments, Newcastle City Council and the community is overseeing the monitoring process. I have said section 61 was designed to give legal basis for sludge disposal to proceed. Existing subsections (1) and (2) do this. Existing subsection (3), however, has the further unintended consequence of giving the Hunter Water Corporation immunity from any claims or actions that may otherwise have arisen in relation to the sludge disposal process. Clearly this is unacceptable. It was not intended to deny residents and landowners a basic common law right of action in the unlikely event that any surface damage is suffered because of the disposal operations. Indeed, it would be inappropriate for a corporation to have such protection. Not only does it not conform to the principles of corporatisation, but it is also outside the level playing field concept upon which corporatisation is based.

Mr ACTING-SPEAKER (Mr Hazzard): Order! The honourable member for Ermington should desist from engaging in conversation in the Chamber.

Mr COLLINS: The Government therefore proposes to amend section 61. Subsections (1) and (2) will remain as they are. Existing subsection (3) will be repealed and new subsections included. In essence, the new provisions ensure that a person's legal rights and remedies are not affected by the exercise of the corporation's powers

under the section. Provision is made, however, to ensure that the corporation is not liable, in a strictly technical sense, to an action in trespass where there is no tangible or material physical damage affecting the surface of the land sustained by the owner. A further provision is made to ensure that a person's legal rights and remedies are assumed to have been approved since the commencement of the principal Act, namely from 1st January, 1992. I reiterate that the mine workings referred to are some 60 metres below the ground and an extensive program is in place to monitor conditions in the mine to ensure they continue to behave as predicted. In addition, two years after the commencement of the sludge disposal process a further review of the project is to be undertaken. The amendment restores citizens' common law rights of action. Accordingly, I commend the bill to the House.

Debate adjourned on motion by Ms Allan.

LAND TAX MANAGEMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL

Bill introduced and read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr SOURIS (Upper Hunter - Minister for Finance, Assistant Treasurer, and Minister for Ethnic Affairs) [7.38]: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Page 6912

The main purpose of the bill is to implement the recommendations of the white paper on land tax. In introducing this bill I should like to restate the Government's commitment to ongoing analysis and reform of State taxation. The Government is also committed to broad community consultation in that process of reform. These commitments are clearly evidenced by this bill and the process which preceded it. The processes leading to this bill included a 1990 inquiry and report on land tax by the Government Treasury advisory committee, chaired by my colleague the honourable member for Pittwater. That inquiry was established following revelations of an unprecedented increase in land valuations resulting from the 1988 property boom. This first step in overhauling the land tax system was followed by a review of the New South Wales land tax base and valuation system, culminating in the publication of the white paper on land tax in February this year. As with the Longley review, extensive public consultation was undertaken before Government decisions on changes to the land tax system were made.

Before I explain the amendments contained in the bill I should like to review briefly the events which ultimately led to the preparation of the white paper. Prior to 1986 all land in New South Wales was revalued on a cyclical basis at intervals of between three and six years. This meant that the effective rate of tax paid by landowners varied according to how old the valuation of their property was and at what stage in the property cycle the last valuation of their land occurred. It also meant that when the cyclical valuation occurred at intervals of between three and six years an owner's land tax liability would increase dramatically and then remain static or fall as the tax threshold was increased until the next revaluation occurred. In order to smooth out the large increases in land tax liability and to ensure that all landowners were taxed on a similar basis the previous Labor Government introduced the equalisation factor system in 1986. Under this system factors determined by the Valuer-General were applied to all values to bring them to a common base date, 18 months prior to the commencement of the relevant

tax year. This system was satisfactory in times when there was relative stability in land values. However, the system failed during the land price spiral of the late 1980s because of the lack of uniformity in changes in values within local government areas.

During the late 1980s property prices in New South Wales increased at an almost unprecedented rate. As a result substantial numbers of taxpayers were faced with sudden large increases in tax liability both in percentage and absolute terms. In the short term these increases in tax liability created capacity to pay problems for taxpayers or their tenants. These problems were exacerbated by the beginning of the worst recession in Australia since the Great Depression, with the accompanying problems for landowners of downward pressure on values and rents and rapidly increasing vacancy rates. At the same time the 18-month lag between the base date for land values and the relevant tax year meant that land values were falling while land tax was rising. I should add that in most years values are either rising or relatively stable, which means that taxpayers are taxed on values which are less than, or at worst no more than, current values. The resulting substantial increase in land tax revenue peaked during a period when Commonwealth funding to the State was cut and stamp duty from real estate and share transactions was collapsing, also as a result of the recession. Hence the State was not in a strong fiscal position to grant concessions in land tax to offset the effects of the recession.

However, following widespread public concern regarding the large increases in land tax liability, the Government in April 1990 announced three land tax initiatives, which ultimately cost \$263 million per annum in revenue forgone: an 18.5 per cent increase in the tax-free threshold from \$135,000 to \$160,000; a 25 per cent reduction in the tax rate from 2 per cent of site value to 1.5 per cent; and a review of land tax by the

Page 6913

Government Treasury advisory committee. These changes to the land tax rate structure reflected the traditional approach of using both the tax rate and the tax-free threshold as mechanisms to manage the impact of large changes in values. In the post-war period the impact of increasing land values based on the taxpayer's ability to pay has been offset by reductions in the highest marginal land tax rate from 3.3 per cent to 1.5 per cent and a 1,500 per cent increase in the tax-free threshold. As a result of the Longley inquiry the Government introduced a large number of reforms directed towards eliminating inconsistencies in the administration of land tax and extending the range of land tax exemptions. Following recent reforms average land tax rates in New South Wales are now below the rates of most other States. Despite these reforms the land tax system remains the subject of criticism, reflecting continuing landowner concern over large increases in tax liability and unrealistic valuations.

In line with the decision announced in the 1990-91 Budget, the white paper report constituted a review of the structure of the land tax system. The objective was to ameliorate capacity to pay problems by improving the timeliness of official land valuations and reducing the volatility of tax assessment while having due regard to the equity, efficiency and administrative costs of the land tax system. The bill before the House will implement the recommendations of the white paper. The key aspects of the changes introduced by the bill are: abolition of the equalisation factor system; provision for the use of annual valuations for all taxable properties, with values determined as at a base date six months prior to the commencement of each land tax year, which is a reduction from the current 18 months lag; enabling the Chief Commissioner of Land Tax to contract with either the Valuer-General or private valuers for the purpose of obtaining annual valuations; allowing taxpayers full rights of objection and appeal against annual valuations; providing for the chief commissioner to refer valuation objections to either the Valuer-General or private valuers; provision for land tax valuations to reflect the legal

impact of interim orders made under the New South Wales Heritage Act on the same basis as permanent orders; provision for land tax valuations to reflect the legal impact of heritage classifications under local environment plans; provision for land tax valuations to reflect the impact of protected tenancies under the Landlord and Tenant (Amendment) Act 1956 on the rent that may be charged; and extension of the exemption for owner-occupied properties exceeding 2,100 square metres to the whole of the land where the chief commissioner is satisfied that planning provisions prevent subdivision.

As a result of these changes, coupled with the downturn in land values, there will be an average 30 per cent reduction in land tax assessment in 1993. Total land tax revenue on a tax year basis is expected to fall from \$759 million in 1992 to \$528 million in 1993. In many of the eastern and northern suburbs, which suffered the brunt of excessive values as a result of the equalisation factor system, the reduction in tax will be even higher, particularly for small landowners whose total property holdings are close to the tax-free threshold. Examples of where average taxable values will fall by more than 30 per cent, and in some cases by more than 50 per cent, include: residential properties in Randwick, Ku-ring-gai, South Sydney, Woollahra and Mosman; business properties in Sydney, Woollahra, South Sydney, Waverley, Randwick and Willoughby; and industrial properties in Willoughby, Randwick, Sydney, South Sydney and Botany. In individual cases where properties have been grossly overvalued by the use of equalisation factors values could fall by more than 60 per cent. In addition, more than 3,000 small taxpayers will cease to be liable for tax altogether because their land holdings will fall below the threshold of \$160,000 at which tax becomes payable. The white paper recommendation that private valuers be allowed to tender for the annual valuation of specified local government areas could not be implemented for the 1993 tax year because of time constraints. Its implementation has therefore been deferred until 1994, even though this bill provides for it. The success of private valuers in tendering will, of course, very much depend on their ability to compete with the Valuer-General.

Page 6914

In regard to measures to reduce the cost of appeal, the Government has directed the Valuer-General to seek to mediate valuation disputes in the Land and Environment Court whenever possible. Mediation was first introduced to the Land and Environment Court in May 1991 and has proved to be a success in terms of saving court sitting time as well as costs for the parties concerned, at least in the majority of cases. Some other amendments to the Land Tax Management Act are designed to overcome minor anomalies which have been identified. The bill amends section 65A to allow the chief commissioner to redetermine the allocation of individual strata entitlements for land tax purposes if satisfied that the value determined in accordance with the relevant unit entitlement is not fair and reasonable. The bill extends a current exemption for land owned and used by non-profit clubs for athletic sports to all sports and games, such as pony clubs, motor bike racing and car racing. The bill provides an additional concession where a building is used partially as a nursing home or retirement home. The current provisions allow a complete exemption where land is used solely for a retirement village, nursing home or both. Where only part of the land is used for these purposes a partial reduction in the taxable value of the land is allowed. However, no concession applies where part of a building is used for non-exempt purposes. The bill will allow a proportionate reduction in the taxable value of land in such cases.

The bill clarifies provisions relating to the taxing of lessees of Crown land. As a result of a series of amendments to the Act since 1985, lessees of Crown land are liable for land tax where they entered into a new lease or renewed an existing lease on or after 1st January, 1987. These provisions were consolidated in a new section 21C of the Land

Tax Management Act, which was introduced from 1st January. Though the new section successfully clarified the land tax position for the 1992 and future tax years, it is now proposed to backdate the application of the new section to Crown land in order to clarify the position for the 1989, 1990 and 1991 tax years. This will not change the liability of lessees, but will make it clear that the Crown is not liable for land tax. It will also result in exemptions for licences and short-term leases of less than 12 months' duration being backdated to the 1989 tax year. I should add that it will not affect lessees of land owned by a local or county council or a public authority.

The Government has held discussions with the honourable member for Bligh regarding the land tax concessions contained in her private member's bill which is currently before the House. The proposals in that bill include abolition of land tax on low income residential housing, an increase in the general exemption threshold - which is currently \$160,000 to \$320,000 - and the abolition of the grouping provisions to apply the threshold to each individual parcel of land. As noted by the Premier, and Treasurer in the Budget Speech the Government cannot afford further significant tax concessions in 1992-93, and those which are contained in the bill of the honourable member for Bligh simply cannot be afforded at this time. However, the Government is committed to a staged expansion of land tax concessions in future years, as budgetary conditions allow. In keeping with that commitment, the current exemption for low-cost boarding-houses will be extended to all forms of low-cost rental accommodation, with effect from the 1994 land tax year for land held at 31st December, 1993. The development will take place with full consultation with affected groups. The other two reform measures proposed by the honourable member for Bligh in her private member's bill, as well as additional measures, will be evaluated in the coming months, and the Government will implement them, if not in the next financial year, within the term of the Fiftieth Parliament if the budgetary situation permits. I thank the honourable member for Bligh for her co-operation in dealing with this sensitive issue. In summary, I believe that the implementation of the white paper recommendations will meet the concerns of land

Page 6915

taxpayers and their tenants, and will result in a more equitable system for all concerned. I commend the bill to the House, and I table a summary of its provisions for the assistance of honourable members.

Debate adjourned on motion by Ms Allan.

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE UPON WASTE MANAGEMENT

Mr HARTCHER (Gosford - Minister for the Environment) [7.52]: I move:

(1) That a Joint Select Committee be appointed to examine and report upon the "Waste Management Green Paper" having regard to:

- (a) the aim to achieve a 50% reduction in waste quantities per capita by the year 2000;
- (b) the need to ensure community involvement into siting decisions for waste management facilities;
- (c) the need to ensure that sufficient capacity is available in waste management facilities to cope with NSW waste management requirements; and
- (d) other matters related to waste management raised in the Green Paper.

(2) That the committee shall consist of six members of the Legislative Assembly and four

members of the Legislative Council.

(3) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Standing Orders of either House:

- (a) that Ms Allan, Mr Downy, Mr Gibson, Dr Kernohan, Dr Macdonald, and Ms Machin be appointed to serve on such committee as members of the Legislative Assembly;
- (b) that the Legislative Council members shall be two members supporting the Government and two members not supporting the Government.

(4) That the Chairman of the committee will be Dr Kernohan.

(5) That at any meeting of the committee any six members shall constitute a quorum, provided that the committee shall meet as a joint committee at all times.

(6) That the Chairman of the committee shall have a deliberative and casting vote.

(7) That the committee have leave to sit during the sittings or any adjournment of either or both Houses; to adjourn from place to place; to make visits of inspection within New South Wales and have power to take evidence and send for persons and papers; and to report from time to time.

(8) That should either or both Houses stand adjourned and the committee agree to any report before the Houses resume sitting:

- (a) the committee have leave to send any such report, minutes and evidence taken before it to the Clerks of each House;
- (b) the documents shall be printed and published and the Clerks shall forthwith take such action as is necessary to give effect to the order of each House; and
- (c) the documents shall be laid upon the Table of each House at its next sitting.

(9) That for the purposes of this inquiry, a Local Government Reference Group be appointed by way of the Chairman inviting the Presidents of the Local Government and Shires Associations to nominate six Association representatives (four city and two rural) to serve on the Group.

(10) That the committee shall liaise with the Local Government Reference Group by:

- (a) inviting a representative of the Local Government Reference Group to attend
hearings of evidence; and
- (b) providing the group with copies of all submissions and transcripts of evidence and inviting comments from the Group on such evidence or submissions.

(11) That the committee may from time to time, meet with the Group to discuss issues raised in submissions or evidence or the committee's draft recommendations.

(12) That the committee shall report to both Houses by no later than the end of the 1993 autumn sittings of Parliament.

I seek leave to table the waste management green paper.

Leave granted.

I am pleased and honoured to announce the release and tabling of the green paper on waste management, which outlines the approach to be taken by the Government to tackle waste problems in New South Wales in the years ahead. The paper is based on two objectives: to ensure community involvement in decisions concerning the location of new waste management facilities, and the reduction of the volume of waste produced in the first place. Reducing the amount of garbage entering the waste stream is an environmental and economic imperative and Cabinet has agreed to adopt a waste reduction standard of 50 per cent over the next eight years. That target is in line with international targets and has been adopted by Ministers of other State and Territories governments and the Commonwealth Government. It has been endorsed by the Australian and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Ministers Council. Though that target is challenging, I am confident that the Government, the community, industry and commerce can and will work together to make it a reality.

The green paper seeks to reduce waste volume through a system of incentives, including the expansion of the industrial waste exchange, the development of a clean technology assistance scheme, support to industry for research and marketing of clean production technologies, and a composting program. The expansion of the highly successful council recycling rebate scheme is also canvassed. That scheme has produced a 40 per cent increase in the volume of materials recycled by councils in its first year. The best performing councils are now recycling about 100 kilograms of garbage per person per year. Unfortunately, some other councils are not performing as well and it will be important to raise the level of recycling at each council to ensure that the amount of recycling in our community increases and continues to increase in the years ahead. The fact that a number of councils have been able already to achieve quite high levels augers well for the future. The significance of this is revealed by reference to the table of council recycling. Manly and Mosman councils recycle in the order of 100 kilograms per person per year, whereas councils at the other end of the table recycle at the rate of 12 or 13 kilograms per person per year. The Government is enthusiastic about trial schemes for charging for garbage by weight and by volume. Seattle, in the United States of America, has achieved tremendous results in recycling in recent years. It is a city that charges for garbage by volume and has had significant results.

The Government believes such schemes should be given a chance. The green paper proposes that the more that is thrown out, the more one pays, but importantly the less that is thrown out, the less one pays. There is no argument that the impact of the green paper will be to increase charges but will reward those who are environmentally responsible and seek to minimise the amount of waste they create or, once waste is created, seek to maximise the amount they reuse and recycle. The green paper looks to penalise those who are indifferent to the amount of waste they create, reuse and recycle

Page 6917

by ensuring that in the end they will be the ones paying higher charges. The green paper will reward the environmentally responsible and penalise the environmentally irresponsible. The green paper emphasises a voluntary rather than a regulatory approach to waste minimisation. The Government believes there is little sense in requiring industry to improve the rate of recycling its products if the end result is stockpiles of unwanted materials. The United States example of newsprint recycling, which led to a world glut in recent years, is a case in point.

There is no simple answer to the waste problems of the State. All sections of the community create waste and all sections must therefore play a role in its minimisation and disposal. As a result the Government is determined to ensure that the community is

involved in making decisions about waste disposal issues. To that end the green paper proposes that government planning powers not be used to override council objections to the location of new tip sites. Consistent with that, the Government decided to withdraw the development application for extensions to the Lucas Heights waste facility and will ensure that similar situations do not arise in future. The green paper further proposes to end the effective monopoly that the Waste Recycling and Processing Service has enjoyed up until now on putrescible waste management in Sydney by allowing participation of the private sector. This does not mean the privatisation of the Waste Recycling and Processing Service, as is being argued, but will ensure effective competition in the waste industry. A large amount of waste - on figures produced to me, about 37 per cent - is already received by the private sector. The Waste Recycling Contractors Association, the principal body in this industry, has been in operation since 1947.

The Government is aware that some councils have questioned whether they have the ability or the resources to manage the establishment of their own waste facilities. The Government is sympathetic to that concern. Accordingly, the Government would be receptive to an approach by local government to acquire the waste service as a going concern. In this respect I should congratulate the commitment of the Local Government and Shires Association to recycling and to establishing its own Local Government Recycling Co-operative. It has seen fit to encourage its member councils to fully participate in waste reduction, reuse and recycling. Local government has responded to the green paper sympathetically and supportively. The committee has been established with the co-operation of the Local Government and Shires Association. The Government is not abandoning its continuing interest in the protection of the environment and will ensure through the Environment Protection Authority that it continues its role as the regulator of waste services to protect the health of the public and the environment of our society.

The green paper proposes that the role of the Environment Protection Authority be expanded to cover country areas, further ensuring that the environment of the whole State is fully and adequately protected. I must emphasise to the House that it is the Government's intention to receive full and comprehensive input from all sections of the community on the green paper before any options are adopted as policy. The green paper is a basis for discussion in the community, a basis upon which the parliamentary committee, which I moved to be established, can make its assessment, and a basis upon which interested groups in the community can make submissions on the future of waste management in this society. The format of the joint select committee is most suitable because it will allow input from all sides of the House, from all political parties and from the Independents. Waste management is widely recognised as an issue which should receive bipartisan support and consideration. Given the vital role that local government plays in waste management I am therefore particularly pleased with the attitude of the Local Government and Shires Association and that it is happy to be involved in the joint select committee process.

I hope all members will read their copy of the green paper and consider the
Page 6918
importance of waste disposal to the environmental and economic future of New South Wales. The Government believes the green paper offers communities the options of developing their own waste facilities or encouraging other areas through financial incentives to develop waste facilities on their behalf. But areas that are prepared to accept a waste facility within their borders must be compensated for doing so. At the heart of the problem faced by some areas in this city up till now is that they are designated as major waste receptacles for other parts of the city but receive no compensation for the loss of social amenity that they suffer through traffic and noise.

The Government believes all communities should have a role in determining their own future and that those that agree to accept a waste facility should be compensated accordingly.

Economic consultants Travers Morgan reported to the Government that the price of waste disposal in Sydney may be significantly less than the long-term cost of providing the service. This conclusion, coupled with the need to ensure that communities are properly compensated for hosting waste facilities, means that waste disposal costs could rise but will only rise for those who do not involve themselves in waste minimisation and reduction. If waste disposal costs were to rise, the incentive that currently exists for overconsumption of landfill space would be removed. In other words, as I have repeatedly said, it will become cheaper to recycle than to throw away. The whole thrust of the green paper is to work in conjunction with the community to develop a society that is based upon the three Rs of reduction, reuse and recycling, rather than a society which has been traditionally based on simply throwing away unused or unrequired items.

The Government proposes to refer waste pricing to the Provisional Pricing Tribunal for comment on the impact of the Government's policies and to ensure that social and environmental costs are properly covered. To prevent monopoly control of the waste industry the Government will consider bringing all waste service providers under the Federal Trade Practices Act. Local councils will be given a wider choice of waste service providers. They will be able to continue to use the waste service's facilities, establish facilities on their own or in consortia with other councils, or use facilities provided by the private sector. The Government is conscious of the fact that its target of a 50 per cent reduction by the year 2000 is ambitious but believes this ambition is well-founded because it is based upon the high level of community good will towards the environment. This is manifested not only in the success of recycling schemes but also by community participation in clean-up programs and by surveys which show that large sections of the community are anxious to do something for the environment and are unhappy that they often lack the opportunity to do so. The Government's approach is aimed at achieving a 50 per cent reduction by the year 2000 based on the principle of volunteerism rather than regulation. However, the Government will provide financial incentives for waste minimisation. The levy of \$2.80 per tonne for waste disposal will be increased to \$4.20 per tonne to pay for increases in recycling rebates to local councils and for other schemes to be developed by the Environment Protection Authority. This will encourage cleaner production and other environmental improvements. Some of the programs that could be funded have been outlined in the green paper.

It has given me great pleasure to work on this green paper which, I believe, is in many respects revolutionary for the State of New South Wales as it is the first effort by a government in this State to break the cycle of the throw-away society. I should acknowledge the great work done up until now by what was previously the Waste Management Authority, now the Waste Recycling and Processing Service. It is a government agency composed of dedicated and hardworking people who, when they first came into office in 1970, found waste disposal in the Sydney metropolitan region in a

Page 6919

state of chaos. It was inefficiently and poorly run. From the chaos the service has created an ordered system whereby garbage and waste disposal in the greater Sydney metropolitan region has been effectively and well managed for a period of 22 years. WRAPS has been self-financing and in fact pays a dividend to the Government. It has built up an expertise unequalled in the rest of Australia. Under the green paper WRAPS will continue as a viable, vital organisation. It will play an essential role, but the Government does not intend that it be a monopoly provider of services any longer; it will simply be a major player in the field. At present WRAPS has 68 per cent of the market.

I should like to pay tribute to Mr John Cook, the managing director of WRAPS, his executives and other staff for their willing assistance in the planning of future waste management in Sydney and the excellent job they have done up until now and will continue to do in waste disposal in the Sydney metropolitan region. The green paper is the culmination of the vision of the former Minister for the Environment, Mr Tim Moore, a man for whom I have always had, and will continue to have, the greatest respect. His vision was to establish, with full community consultation, a plan to effectively tackle the State's waste problems. I believe this green paper goes a long way to achieving that goal. I should like also to place on record my appreciation to my policy adviser, Andrew Speers who has worked extremely hard for the development of this paper.

Mr ACTING-SPEAKER (Mr Hazzard): Order! I call the honourable member for Smithfield to order.

Mr HARTCHER: The honourable member for Smithfield may be cynical but other members of the House are not like him. I believe the work of my policy adviser will go a long way towards achieving the vision of effective waste management in this State. Finally, this policy addresses an issue with which I have been concerned for some time. Anyone with a family in New South Wales will recognise the need to plan for the protection of our common heritage. Effective management of waste is one of the greatest environmental challenges facing the people of Australia today. I am proud that the Government of New South Wales is now facing that challenge and is looking forward to the full involvement of the community. I commend the motion.

Debate adjourned on motion by Ms Allan.

APPROPRIATION BILL

BUSINESS FRANCHISE LICENCES (PETROLEUM PRODUCTS) AMENDMENT BILL

MOTOR VEHICLES TAXATION (AMENDMENT) BILL

ROAD IMPROVEMENT (SPECIAL FUNDING) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 13th October.

Mrs GRUSOVIN (Heffron) [8.15]: I turn my attention to the Budget, particularly in relation to the portfolio that I shadow - housing. Recently some concerns have been registered in relation to a foreshadowed restructuring within the Department of Housing. Various press reports have stated that restructuring will involve the loss of

Page 6920

355 jobs, a number of those in rural areas. On 1st September, the first day this Parliament resumed, I asked a question of the Premier seeking clarification of the foreshadowed job losses. I did not get a very satisfactory answer. Following a subsequent question to the Minister for Housing the Opposition was assured that if there had been any thoughts about possible restructuring they have been superseded - was the word used - by the arrival of a new Minister. However, I am concerned that the Budget Papers foreshadow this restructuring, which will undoubtedly involve job losses. The Budget Papers mention that the department is "planning a number of strategies to improve efficiency and optimise future investment in rental housing", and go on to say:

Through the application of improved technology to its repairs and maintenance service and by development of alternative rent payment options for tenants, significant operational efficiencies are anticipated.

To achieve those expected operational efficiencies I presume a number of bodies will be eliminated along the way. The Budget Papers continue:

In addition, other strategies are being developed to ensure that the income support and social justice strategies of the Commonwealth and State Governments are complementary.

Much more social justice is being delivered at a Federal level than at this State's level. At the end of June resources sent back to consolidated revenue included \$38.5 million allocated for community services, and of that sum more than \$11 million was money unspent on disability services. One would have to be concerned about what this Government is doing about social justice. The papers on which I structured my question to the Premier on 1st September indicated that there would be a deal of downsizing because of contracting out and computerisation. It was intimated that rent collection was being looked at most seriously. In fact, it was proposed that Australia Post take over rent collection. The papers that I obtained acknowledged that this action would have a major effect in country regions, involving up to 30 office closures. I know that the new Minister has given an assurance that this will not happen, but I want to put on the record here and now that I will be waiting with great interest to see the results of the department contracting out the collection of rent to Australia Post and the change in procedures to maintenance and repairs. By that stage maintenance and repairs will be handled by other means.

If this proposed restructuring occurs, the human face of the Department of Housing that deals with tenants will be lost. The Heffron electorate has a large component of public housing estates in Redfern and Waterloo, and I will go very public if there is an attempt to remove the human bodies who provide at least some link to the tenants in public housing in dealing with some of the massive problems they encounter, particularly the sorts of problems encountered by my electorate office. It is not sound deployment of resources and good managerial strategy if in the future my electorate secretary has to ring a 008 number and leave a message on the answering machine of some disseminated body. It takes enough time now to sort out these problems. The Minister should be looking closely at this matter. The director of the department has acknowledged that the nature and extent of the restructuring that is being undertaken, the impact upon client service delivery activities and office locations, and the opportunity to take advantage of contracting departmental services are as yet not fully determined. But I think the process is well under way. I raise a number of concerns. I do not know whether office locations have already been decided upon. Looking at figure work that is available to me, I do not believe there would be only 30 office closures in country areas; I believe there would be a large number of closures in metropolitan Sydney. I think that would be a most retrograde step.

Page 6921

I turn now to what is happening to housing maintenance. In the Budget Papers and other papers that I have obtained, some real economy measures are to be applied in maintenance and upgrading programs for public housing. Some of the guidelines that have been issued make interesting reading in regard to capital improvements and the question of maintenance. Some restrictions will apply to capital improvements. New drive tracks will be completed only where existing drive tracks are in a dangerous state.

Fencing will be renewed only where existing fencing cannot be repaired, which is a sensible proposition. Dwellings will be re-roofed only where there are major leaks that are unable to be repaired. Wiring will be rewired only where existing wiring is in a dangerous state. Water services will be renewed only where existing services are unserviceable. I hope those repairs will be carried out, otherwise the Department of Housing will have to appear before the Residential Tenancies Tribunal to explain why it is not providing services that are paid for by tenants.

The guidelines also state that no alterations will be made to entries to dwellings. Some of the proposals reveal that not much will be done in the area of maintenance. Maybe all the money will be spent on buying computers to comply with foreshadowed computerisation of maintenance services. It is interesting to note other measures that are to be implemented. In future walls will not be painted when they can be washed. Faulty walls will not be resheeted if they can be patched. Prime cost items will not be replaced unless it is uneconomical to repair them. Electrical fittings will be replaced only where necessary. For heaven's sake, what does that mean? The installation of fluorescent lighting will be suspended in lieu of existing incandescent lighting. I presume that is a real recognition of environmental issues. Long-term savings can be made by the installation of new types of fluorescent lighting. Some of these guidelines are just a waste of paper. Other guidelines include a suspension of the installation of exhaust fans. People who have mould problems or health problems in their dwellings will not have exhaust fans installed because that might cost a few dollars.

Concrete repairs will be restricted. I hope only few buildings have concrete cancer because that might also be a short-term approach. Fencing maintenance and repainting of vacant properties are to be restricted. Because of vandalism these dwelling-places must be properly maintained. Maintenance should be provided to ensure that things do not get out of hand. These proposals will lead to a running down of public housing stock. The Government is not too concerned about that. What is the Government doing in regard to the public equity partnership scheme? We do not hear an awful lot about the PEP scheme. It is no wonder because guidelines issued to Department of Housing staff contained the following instruction:

Under no circumstances are staff to refer any tenant to the owner of the properties or continue to identify AMP as the beneficial owner of the property.

The instruction continues:

The Department has an entitlement within the PEP No. 1 scheme to relet vacancies within the first year only; thereafter any vacancies must be let to a private tenant or the premises sold.

Originally the PEP scheme was mooted as a wonderful idea to provide more people in this State with housing accommodation. The way in which this scheme is being used is another attempt to privatise public housing by stealth. The guidelines go on to refer to tenants in public housing who are to be transferred. Some have already been transferred, some will be transferred at the end of this year and others will be transferred next year. This will not be possible for tenants of PEP-nominated properties, that is, public housing tenants who thought that they would be treated as public housing tenants. Once there has

Page 6922

been a transfer of property under the PEP scheme those tenants will not be able to arrange mutual exchanges or have any modifications carried out at their homes following a disabling illness or accident. The instruction then states:

Immediate rehousing is to be considered in these cases -

I hope they have luck. The instruction states that, in those circumstances, no property improvements will be carried out. The instruction also states:

In all other respects, PEP Scheme tenants will receive the same level of service/consideration as those occupying general housing accommodation.

They will not be enjoying the same circumstances as other public housing tenants because they will have lost some important rights. In the meantime, hundreds of public housing dwellings that are being lost are being transferred to the PEP scheme. I turn now to the Minister's statement concerning the 1992-93 Budget. It is quite different from the statement on the Budget issued by the former Minister, the Hon. Joe Schipp, in 1991-92. The 1991-92 statement by the then Minister for Housing talks at length about the wonders of HomeFund, home ownership, all the wonderful loans that can be obtained, all the funding that has been made available and the \$5 million mortgage assistance available for that scheme. A lot of people with problems need mortgage assistance. Most honourable members would know that if they had listened to questions that have been raised by members of the Opposition in this place over the past year. This year we do not have much of a statement from the new Minister for Housing. We have just a short line which states:

To ensure the efficient and effective delivery of housing services across all housing tenures the Government has initiated an inquiry into aspects of the operations of the Department of Housing and is reviewing the future direction and operation of the HomeFund Home Lending program.

After quoting some figures the Minister's statement continues:

Total Housing Program

This figure does not include funding allocations for home loan programs which will not be finalised until after the HomeFund review.

Until there is a full disclosure of the extent of this mess, obviously the Government will not be in a position to know what allocations can be made and what major debts the Government and the taxpayers of New South Wales are facing - not to mention the personal pain, suffering and trauma of thousands of HomeFund borrowers and their families in New South Wales. The McMurtrie review was announced on 3rd August by the new Minister - thankfully we have a new Minister - to try to clear up some of this mess, but he has a difficult task ahead of him. I hope that review will disclose the true nature of the problems relating to HomeFund, but I have some doubts. The chairman of that review is carrying out that job part-time; he is doing so pro bono - in an honorary capacity. With this major task ahead of him, one wonders whether he will be able to devote his full attention to the review. He is being aided by some people who have played a substantial role in the process of the setting up and operations of First Australian National Mortgage Acceptance Corporation Limited.

The Secretary of Treasury has been a director of FANMAC since its inception and would be one of the few people who know what has been going on in that area. The Minister said that this part-time chairman has a secretariat. The secretariat is one man. I understand that secretariat of one man has a one-person secretarial support service, presumably to answer the telephone and deal with the large amount of correspondence

I imagine would be coming in. I foreshadow some concerns as to the way in which this review is being conducted and whether it will get to the truth of the matter. If the review does not get to the bottom of it, somewhere down the track there will have to be another inquiry until the truth of the matter is revealed. Ultimately the truth will out, as most honourable members know. This week I received deputations from people who travelled down from the North Coast of New South Wales. They represent about 50 HomeFund borrowers, all in difficulty. I understand I will receive documentation on 40 similar cases from the same area in the next week or so. It causes me great pain to deal with people experiencing difficulties. [*Extension of time agreed to.*]

Yesterday the Financial Counsellors Association of New South Wales at the Redfern Legal Centre joined with the HomeFund Helpline, the North Coast action group and HomeFund fightback - various groups organised by HomeFund borrowers who are in difficulty. They will be joining with the HomeFund Helpline, which was established some months ago by Peter O'Keeffe and Suzanne Kennedy, two people who lost their jobs after they became whistleblowers and went public. They had the temerity to go on the "Investigators" program to let people know that borrowers were not receiving their contractual rights. They have been providing that service free to thousands - I do not exaggerate - of HomeFund borrowers. It is estimated that, together with my office, they have dealt with about 4,000 queries relating to HomeFund. I am delighted that yesterday those other groups came forward and are seeking a deputation to the Premier and the Minister for Housing to discuss the problems and receive some answers because they are not sure whether the review will provide those answers. I asked a question of the Minister for Consumer Affairs this afternoon about her role and responsibility for the New South Wales Fair Trading Act, legislation of which the Minister seems reasonably well aware.

Every day the Minister has provided warnings to consumers - members of the community - about faulty products or companies that are ripping people off. The Minister did not seem to have a grasp of my question today. I suppose a briefing note was provided to her by the Minister for Housing, but I believe that as the Minister for Consumer Affairs she has a responsibility to grasp this issue. If ever a group of consumers in this State has been ripped off, despite the supposed safeguards of the New South Wales Fair Trading Act, it is HomeFund borrowers. Under the New South Wales Fair Trading Act the Minister has a responsibility to understand this problem and should have issued warnings to the public against taking up these loans. In the estimates committee debates in October last year I raised with the then Minister for Consumer Affairs, the Hon. Peter Collins, questions about some of the schemes promoted by HomeFund. I called on him to have those schemes suspended under the New South Wales Fair Trading Act because of false and misleading representation. In the "Home Finance" supplement of the *Sun-Herald* newspaper an advertisement for Long Homes reads:

With Long Homes and the Rent/Buy Scheme, \$1,250 could get you into a home of your own. Special offer. With the Department of Housing. From \$1,250 full deposit.

It is a good job it was the Government and not a private company promoting that scheme because, if I were the Minister, the company would be hauled in under the New South Wales Fair Trading Act. Is the Government really serious about attacking this problem? The review was announced on 3rd August yet a brochure promoting the Home Show at Darling Harbour from 15th to 23rd August - after the review was announced - contained colour advertisements stating, "HomeFund. Home loans. New South Wales Government." False and misleading information is being provided to the public. Every

last one of the hundreds of people whom I have seen personally in my office will say they thought they were getting a government loan. They thought it was safe. The fancy brochures refer to home loans from the State Government and say, "You can do it. You can own your own home". This scheme was supposed to put people into their homes. It is putting people out of their homes, and the community will not tolerate much more of this. An advertisement in the press in September stated:

New home and land packages from \$154 a week. Affordable Government finance on every home.

The Government knows that these are not government loans; they have nothing to do with the Government. Every time a question was asked of Mr Schipp in the past 12 months he said that the loans had nothing to do with the Government; it was FANMAC and it stood apart. The Government cannot have it both ways. It cannot advertise saying that if people get into trouble mortgage assistance will be made available if that is not so. The Minister spoke today about the wonderful mortgage assistance that is available. Mortgage assistance has been made available in a number of cases but it does run out after a time and the borrower is required to repay that mortgage assistance at interest rates of up to 14 per cent. My concern is for the borrowers who have never been given their rights and entitlements under their contractual agreements, that is, their mortgage documents. I have correspondence from Mr Schipp, the former Minister for Housing, dated early this year. He wrote to a person who had a contractual agreement for an affordable home loan, which meant the borrower would never have to pay more than 27 per cent of his income even if he lost his job, or lost his overtime component and had to receive social security benefits.

The letter from the Minister told the honourable member for Maitland, who had written on behalf of a constituent, that the family would be given a further four months of reduced payments, which should allow sufficient time for the family to overcome its problems. He said that this would be the final offer of assistance by the department as "you have now utilised 20 months of reduced repayments". That constituent was entitled to reduced repayments for the next 50 years if necessary, no matter what was his income. He was never required to pay more than 27 per cent of his income. Do honourable members think that person was told about that? No, he was not. I want to know what the Minister for Consumer Affairs and her department are doing to protect the interests of consumers. It seems to me that the Minister is not even aware that last Sunday morning a Sydney radio program promoted these same HomeFund loans. Who was doing the promoting? It was being done by former chairman of the Housing Co-operative Association of New South Wales, Bob Ward, the present director of the Housing Co-operative Association, Ross Chandler, the secretary of the Campbelltown Co-operative. I might say that Campbelltown is known as arrears city because of the number of people there with debts and problems as a result of home loans. The people from that association were promoting these loans and telling unsuspecting potential borrowers that this is a great scheme and they should get into it; telling them that they would not lose their homes because the co-operatives would make sure they kept them. They said that if people got into difficulties they should simply go to the co-operative, explain the problem and they would receive help.

I cannot believe that this sort of thing has been allowed to happen. False information is being given to people. When they get into trouble they are told that one of the problems has been that they did not seek help soon enough from the co-operative. They are told not to come in when they are three or four months in arrears. I have been dealing with a large number of people who have realised that they were heading into

difficulties, perhaps with an impending pregnancy, because of illness or the loss or potential loss of employment. They cannot seek mortgage assistance; they cannot even submit an application until they are in arrears. I question why the Minister for Consumer Affairs and the department are supposed to be providing consumer protection in this State, and yet these loans are continually promoted and radio programs tout for business by encouraging more people to become involved in the evil net of HomeFund, a scheme that was supposed to put people into homes but is now putting people out of homes.

I noted that the Minister for Consumer Affairs spoke today about assistance to HomeFund borrowers and the wonderful things that could be done. The former Minister for Consumer Affairs, the Hon. Peter Collins, was made aware of the problems with HomeFund in the middle of this year. He announced that the Department of Consumer Affairs had provided assistance to 34 HomeFund borrowers since November last year. That demonstrates how bad the problem is. The department does not notify consumers. It does not advertise that services are available to help them. The former Minister was so concerned about the matter he decided that the present \$100,000 limit under the Credit (Home Finance Contracts) Act was insufficient and should be increased to \$125,000 because a number of people were missing out. He said also that from November last year to April this year, he had received 115 applications under the hardship provisions of the Act and that 30 per cent of those were lodged by HomeFund borrowers. A favourable result was achieved in 98 per cent of the cases in which there was intervention. [*Time expired.*]

Mr PETCH (Gladesville) [8.45]: Before speaking in this budget debate I take the opportunity of congratulating the honourable member for Ku-ring-gai and the honourable member for Gordon on their maiden speeches. I am pleased to note that the honourable member for Ku-ring-gai is in the Chamber. I wish both honourable members a long and happy career in this Parliament.

[*Interruption from gallery*]

Mr ACTING-SPEAKER (Mr Tink): Order in the public gallery.

Mr PETCH: I congratulate the Government on presenting an exceptionally responsible budget for 1992-93, a budget presented in one of the worst recessions Australia has experienced for about 60 years. The Budget has been presented at a time of continuing recession. Despite media speculation and confident assertions by the Prime Minister to the contrary, the recession has not turned the corner. One of the Prime Minister's own colleagues said in a recent statement that the recession will not turn the corner for some time. Since I became a member of this House in 1988 the Federal Government has shortchanged New South Wales by almost \$1.4 billion every year. That amounts to \$5,600 million to date, which would have gone a long way towards expediting capital works programs and providing additional services. That demonstrates clearly that New South Wales is leading the rest of the Commonwealth with its sound economic policies. New South Wales families are better off than families in any other part of the country. Despite all the Federal cuts the Budget has been engineered to provide the highest level of support to the unemployed and their families and at the same time to provide record funding for health and roads. In 1992-93 the State's capital program will be boosted by \$540 million to \$5,894 million. That is a real increase over last year, after inflation of 10.1 per cent. That substantial real growth in the capital program is the biggest boost to capital works undertaken by any New South Wales government since the mid-1980s. It will greatly stimulate economic activity and lay the groundwork for New South Wales to emerge from the recession in better shape than any other State. The boost

to the State's capital program is estimated by Treasury to add more than \$1.7 billion to the New South Wales gross State product and increase employment by creating 18,000 jobs once the direct and indirect multiplier effects are taken into account.

One of the big issues facing the people of Gladesville is land tax. The Government has devoted careful attention to that issue. It has been the subject of many complaints I have received as the local member and the subject of many representations. Last year's white paper was completed and issued. I am pleased to learn that almost all of the recommendations contained in it will be implemented in the 1993 land tax year. In 1992-93 and the years ahead land tax revenue will decline by almost \$220 million in real terms. In that land tax year, receipts from land tax will be only 70 per cent of what they were in 1992. In real terms total land tax assessments for 1993 will be no greater than they were in 1988, before the property boom anticipated on land tax assessments. The most significant reform is the abolition of the equalisation factor introduced by the former Labor Government. That placed an unjust burden on people who live in the Hunters Hill area and had a tremendous multiplier effect. People who live in the Hunters Hill region and other affluent areas of Sydney pay an unjust part of the burden. A greater burden is placed upon them because the Government believes they have a greater capacity to pay. From 1993 all taxable properties will be revalued each year and there will be a reduction in the time lag between the date of valuation and the tax year from 18 months to 6 months. As a result landowners will be able to object against unrealistic valuations each and every year. The reforms, together with the slump in the property market, mean that there will be an average 37 per cent reduction in land tax in 1993.

This will mean a fall in revenue from \$759 million in the 1992 land tax year to \$528 million in 1993. In many suburbs where taxpayers have suffered the brunt of excessive values, falls will be even higher, ranging between 30 per cent and 60 per cent. It is paramount that the Government contains debt. With this Budget New South Wales is paying its way. Thanks to the public sale of the GIO - and I am pleased to see in the gallery John Crawford, the Deputy General Manager - we do not need to borrow to pay for the Budget deficit. In addition we will be retiring \$430 million of Commonwealth debt raised on behalf of the State. This represents a total debt containment initiative in 1992-93 of more than \$1.6 billion. The privatisation of the State Bank is provisionally planned for the second half of 1993-94. However, prior to a commitment to this course of action, a full commercial assessment of the bank, its financial position and the approach to sale will be undertaken.

The projected Budget result for 1992-93 is a deficit of \$1,225 million, responsibly lower in a recession than the deficit in 1991-92. This consists of a current surplus of \$1,067 million and a capital deficit of \$2,292 million. The overall deficit is 0.9 per cent of gross State product. This compares with a deficit of 1.1 per cent in 1986-87, the last time the economy was in recession, albeit a much milder one than at present. After account is taken of the sale of the GIO, the Budget result is a surplus of \$465 million. Employment and training are of paramount importance to this Government. In 1992-93 employment training programs will be allocated \$47 million, directed at providing the opportunity for the longer term unemployed to upgrade their skills and enhance their opportunities for employment. It is particularly important that school leavers are provided with an opportunity to enter the work force. The first chance program introduced last December is aimed at providing school leavers with training to assist their employment prospects. This program will receive funds of \$5 million for 1992-93 and will be reviewed at the end of this period.

This Budget demonstrates the Fahey Government's commitment to education in the Gladesville electorate. Capital works funded in Gladesville through this Budget are the Meadowbank College of Technical and Further Education stage six computing centre, to be undertaken this year for \$5.95 million and the Ryde College of Technical and Further Education food school, hotel suite, and library will be completed this year with the injection of an additional \$301,000. Another significant initiative included in this Budget is that the Legal Aid Commission has been allocated an additional \$1.8 million to meet increased demand as courts address the backlog of cases. When times are bad and people are out of money local members become inundated with requests for legal aid assistance. It is pleasing that this additional funding has been allocated. A \$500,000 grant is made for the establishment of a film and television production fund for strategic production investment in the local film industry which, because of Sydney's climatic advantages, has enormous job potential. Movies such as "Strictly Ballroom", now being acclaimed overseas as box office hits, indicate the worth of investment of real capital funds in Australian films.

I acknowledge in the gallery the presence of the President of the Australian Racing Drivers Club and one of the leading drivers in Australia, Colin Bond. The construction of the new athletics stadium and aquatic centre at Homebush Bay will cost \$85 million in 1992-93 compared with expenditure of \$28 million last year. These much needed major sporting facilities will cost ultimately \$300 million and will be completed by 1994. These facilities are the centre of focus for Sydney's bid to host the Olympic Games in the year 2000. I do not need to remind honourable members how important the Olympic Games are to the State and how we are working hard as a dedicated team to ensure Sydney secures those games. Last Friday night, when I represented the Minister at the annual prize giving for the New South Wales Soccer Federation, it was urged that the profile of soccer should be lifted. In Europe soccer is not a sport; it is a religion. Promoting soccer in this country will show that Australia is worthy of hosting the Olympic Games in the year 2000.

A major initiative of the budget is a \$10 million family support package to assist those hard hit by the recession. It includes family support initiatives, rental and mortgage relief, financial counselling and training of financial counsellors, rural counselling services and enhancements of the community services grants program to continue last year's initiative. The package is aimed at helping people through what we hope is the last year of this disastrous national recession. It will be co-ordinated by the Department of Community Services but will involve several other departments and major non-government and charity organisations which have provided valuable guidance in developing this package. The Ryde family support scheme has dedicated workers, and I refer to Rosemary Wells and Karen Foster who this week met with me and another organisation to establish a support group to assist older people in the community who have lost their jobs through the recession we had to have. There must be nothing more devastating to a man who has worked all his adult life to end up losing his job midlife. That man must return home to his family with a lowered self-esteem. Community support is necessary and the Ryde family support group and the Uniting Church will encourage self-esteem and provide trauma support during this interim period.

This year the Water Board and sewerage services have been allocated \$724 million, an increase of \$33 million or 2.5 per cent in real terms. This expenditure will continue statewide, with improvements in environmental protection, water quality and system reliability. I congratulate the Minister for the Environment on his approach to the environment. Today many problems must be addressed and with the Minister's capable direction these issues will receive the required attention. Pollution control has received

an allocation of \$16 million and a review of the current licensing systems will be conducted. An allocation of \$5.5 million for waste minimisation has been provided and \$3.5 million for management of hazardous waste, chemicals and radiation - an issue which recently has received much publicity. An allocation of \$3 million has been made for research, including laboratory facilities; \$8 million for water quality monitoring; \$5 million for air quality monitoring; and \$1 million for dual problems of motor vehicle air and noise pollution. This Government's approach to environmental issues is responsible. The Minister and the secretary to the Minister, the honourable member for Ermington, are dedicated to ensuring that protection of the environment is maintained at the highest possible level.

Roads construction and maintenance throughout New South Wales is the largest spending area under the State's capital works program, amounting to a record \$1,499 million this year, an increase of more than \$285 million, or nearly 21 per cent in real terms. An amount of \$3,912 million will be spent on road construction, maintenance, traffic management and road safety. The 3 x 3 component of funds for all electorates for this year totals \$2,284 million. Included in this funding allocation are the following: extended 3 x 3 council determined allocations for the Hunters Hill Municipal Council, \$58,000; widening of the road to five lanes at the West Ryde railway underpass from Hermitage Road towards West Ryde, \$513,000; and a new culvert under Epping Road at Porters Creek, \$923,000. Numerous representations have been made in relation to this matter, particularly on behalf of the people residing in the area of direct flooding. At times of heavy rain not only does the Epping Road flood at that particular point, which is the cup in the road, but so do the properties on the southern side. I am delighted to see the Budget includes allocations for \$923,000 to complete this work.

For restoration of the Epping Road between Delhi Road and Pittwater Road, North Ryde, \$380,000 is allocated; for school safety speed zoning measures at various sites in the electorate, \$154,000; and local area traffic management schemes, \$256,000. Local councils will also benefit, particularly from the extended 3 x 3 component. The extended 3 x 3 was not favourably received at the time it was introduced, but the people of New South Wales, particularly those in the Gladesville electorate, are becoming aware that goals and benefits can be achieved from accelerated road programs without Federal funding if we all pull together. This is what is called responsible government and a responsible approach. The Gladesville electorate has received a total of \$200,000 to be shared between Ryde and Hunters Hill councils. As stated earlier, Hunters Hill will receive \$58,000 while Ryde will receive \$142,000. I congratulate the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works, and Minister for Roads for the genuine interest he has shown for the Gladesville electorate. [*Extension of time agreed to.*]

The transport portfolio's \$809.2 million capital works program provides the continued expansion of essential services for New South Wales. As a member of the parliamentary transport committee, I was thrilled to see the continued commitment. The major components of the transport portfolio capital works allocation are as follows: State Rail Authority, \$693.7 million; State Transit Authority, \$36.6 million; Maritime Services Board, \$28.8 million; and Department of Transport, \$50.1 million. The Government has pledged \$980,000 to the Gladesville electorate. CityRail will spend \$250,000 on signal improvement works between Meadowbank and Hornsby. An allocation of \$700,000 has been made for overhead wiring structure works between North Strathfield and Rhodes. Another \$30,000 will be spent erecting wind breaks at Meadowbank station. The former member for Ryde in another government would know all about the wind at Meadowbank. It is pleasing to see members in a jovial spirit enjoying this wonderful Budget the Government has brought down.

One achievement for the Gladesville electorate, which also applies to the Parramatta and Ermington electorates, is the greater use of the Parramatta River for transportation. The new bus-ferry interchange at Huntleys Point, Gladesville, was recently opened, providing all-weather facilities between buses and ferries. The two RiverCats - the Dawn Fraser and the Betty Cuthbert - are in full operation, transporting large numbers of passengers. The determination of the Minister that the fare structure should be exactly the same on the RiverCats as the Sirius-class ferry services is proof that the new RiverCats are providing a very popular form of transport. RiverCats Nos 3 and 4 are due to be completed in February next year at a cost of \$5.124 million. RiverCats Nos 5 and 6 have been ordered at a purchase cost of \$6.9 million. When the six RiverCats are in operation the Parramatta River will be an all RiverCat service from Circular Quay to Parramatta. Dredging of the Parramatta River is already taking place, the Silverwater area is also in progress, and the wharf at Charles Street, Parramatta, will offer a direct service from the Gladesville electorate. People wishing to travel to Parramatta can take the bus trip to the Gladesville ferry, join the ferry and enjoy a very comfortable and quick trip on the RiverCat service all the way to Parramatta. This has been an initiative of the Government's "can do" Minister for Transport. Bruce Baird has been one of the outstanding Ministers in this Government in his capacity as Minister for Transport. He can see the horizon, has answered the challenge and continues to provide some of the best transportation systems, to the envy of other States.

Health continues to be a top priority of the Government, with \$4.63 billion to be spent in the 1992-93 fiscal year, an increase of \$1.46 billion or 17.6 per cent over the last Labor Budget. Every year for the past five years the Federal Labor Government has cut health funding to New South Wales by \$250 million, and this year was no different. In Gladesville \$245,000 has been guaranteed for the tidying up process at the declared contaminated site at Nelsons Parade, Hunters Hill. An amount of \$50,000 has been pledged to the continuing Gladesville Macquarie Hospital development. The Government has already spent substantial amounts of money with the new admission centre at Macquarie Hospital, the updated electrical system at Gladesville Hospital, the upgrading of the wards and the road system throughout the hospital. This is another continuation of the commitment of the Government to mental health. In terms of education, youth affairs and employment, almost \$5 billion will be spent on education, employment and training in New South Wales during 1992-93. This Budget demonstrates the strong commitment of the Fahey Government to education in the Gladesville electorate. Capital works funded in Gladesville through the Budget for the Meadowbank college of TAFE stage 6 computing centre has been \$5.975 million and the catering school, hotel suite and library of Ryde College of TAFE will now be completed with the injection of another \$301,000.

In relation to housing, there is always a lot of speculation about who said and did what. The former Minister for Housing related earlier that in April 1988, one month after this Government was elected, people obtained some of the allocations for home loans - a source of debate at the moment. Those loans had been engineered in the term of the former Labor Government. Now, when in opposition, Labor members have the hide and audacity to criticise the Minister for something Labor administrations did. The Opposition should get its facts right. I would like to have made many comments earlier during the speech of a certain member, but I let the member just rave on and on. I am sure that if the Minister had been here he would have had a lot to say, but that is another issue. The overall housing capital works allocation in 1992-93 is \$656 million, comprising \$113 million on council and water rates and \$543 million on rental subsidies

to those public tenants on low incomes.

Page 6930

In this year's Budget \$3.589 million has been allocated for works currently in progress and new works to be commenced during 1992-93 in the Gladesville electorate. The honourable member for Cabramatta knows as well as I do that those who want Department of Housing accommodation must have their names registered on the waiting list. The accommodation can be provided only if the houses have been built. It is pleasing that this Government has made a commitment to invest in public housing. I am proud of that commitment and I am proud of what has been achieved in the Gladesville electorate. I am sure that if the honourable member for Cabramatta took the same approach, he would achieve as much for his electorate. He has to stop being a knocker and start recognising that there is a good government in office and that he should work with it. It is estimated that during 1992-93 the following amounts will be paid to councils and water authorities whose boundaries lie wholly or partly within the electorate: Hunters Hill Municipal Council, \$49,000; Ryde Municipal Council, \$543,000; and the Water Board, \$45,500,000. That shows the commitment the Government has to the Water Board for maintenance and upgrading work. The Water Board budget for the central and eastern metropolitan regions provides \$13,720,000 for maintenance of properties and \$12,680,000 for capital improvements to existing blocks.

The credibility of the Government will be judged by its lasting achievements, not by empty promises and quick fixes. This is the only way of providing real jobs for the people of New South Wales and of ensuring a secure future for the next generation. We have three priorities in this Budget: to help revive the New South Wales economy with a one-time boost to necessary capital works; to bear down on State debt and superannuation liabilities so as not to get sucked into the economic quagmire of our southern and western neighbours; and to make the New South Wales public sector a model of excellence that will truly serve the public. One does not have to be an economic or financial expert to understand these goals. These are the goals that everyone in New South Wales can understand. It is a challenge that this Government took on at a time of extreme economic downturn. In reality the well-being of New South Wales reflects very much the excellent leadership that Nick Greiner gave us during his years as Premier. That leadership set the foundation on which this Government and the people of New South Wales can build. It is a future that we can look forward to with pride. We are all dedicated to make it work. Government members hope that members opposite will join with us and appreciate the achievements rather than knock them. We hope Opposition leaders will appreciate and understand the values that this Government is providing for the people of this State. It is a great pleasure for me to support this Budget.

Ms ALLAN (Blacktown) [9.13]: I am sure the constituents of the honourable member for Cabramatta who are in the gallery this evening would have been convinced, after hearing that contribution from the honourable member for Gladesville, of the differential in the treatment meted out to the people of western and southwestern Sydney compared with the allocations enjoyed by the electorate of Gladesville. If we are to believe recent opinion polls, it seems that the Premier is receiving remarkable support from women in New South Wales. In my contribution to this debate this evening I should like to analyse the performance of John Fahey as Treasurer and the effect of his Budget on the women of New South Wales. I should like to refer specifically to the statement relating to programs for women that accompany the Budget Papers. The first matter to which I wish to refer relates to the New South Wales Anti-Discrimination Board. For many women, and other people in this State who have experienced

disadvantage in many areas of society, the Anti-Discrimination Board represents the symbol of a government's commitment to equal opportunity in all sectors of society.

Page 6931

An examination of this year's Budget Papers as they relate to the Anti-Discrimination Board shows a significant reduction in the amount of expenditure in almost all areas of operations of the board. For example, in policy and law reform funding is down from \$215,000 to \$184,000. This is partly reflected in a reduction in Commonwealth funding but State funding has also been reduced from \$192,000 to \$180,00. In community education and public communication, though total funding has increased from \$359,000 to \$402,000 as a result of a grant of \$103,000 from the Education and Training Foundation, direct State funding has again fallen from \$320,000 to \$299,000. In the important core area of conciliation of complaints by the Anti-Discrimination Board total funding has been reduced from almost \$500,000 to \$388,000. That includes the termination of Commonwealth funding of \$50,000 and a reduction in State funding from \$406,000 to \$379,000 - almost \$30,000.

For ongoing inquiries conducted by the Anti-Discrimination Board, some of which have been satisfactorily completed, there has been a reduction in the amount of money allocated to all areas, including major inquiries such as discrimination against people with HIV and AIDS. That funding has been reduced from \$20,000 to \$8,000. The funding also affects work associated with the International Labour Organisation convention relating to family responsibilities, and age discrimination. Decreases in funding for all core functions have occurred, apart from the one and only maintenance of funding to the present pregnancy inquiry. Compared with last year's expenditure, the Budget figures show a reduction in funding of \$107,000 for the Anti-Discrimination Board. When that is compared with last year's estimate of \$441,000, one sees that the reduction represents a whopping 29 per cent decrease in expenditure. Last year the Anti-Discrimination Board underspent its budget by \$334,000. It has now experienced a reduction of almost 30 per cent in expenditure. In terms of general performance of the Attorney General's Department the estimates show that almost \$7 million has been allocated to policy development and research services on legislative and legal services. In that \$7 million nothing specific is provided for sexual assault. The Minister assisting the Premier on the status of women, the Hon. Anne Cohen, in her foreword to the women's budget statement, said:

The Women's Budget Statement reflects the Government's priorities for women in terms of budget expenditure and allocation for programs which increase women's safety and security; and aim to decrease and prevent the occurrence of domestic violence, sexual assault, sexual harassment and discrimination.

Despite those claims, there has been no attempt by this Government to address continuing issues of concern in those areas, including police procedures for sexual assault and rape, the effectiveness of rape crisis centres, or possible reforms to the Crimes (Sexual Assault) Act 1981 to expedite and facilitate court proceedings with the aim of further reducing the ordeal of court proceedings for rape victims, while maintaining the rights of the accused. I wonder whether either the Minister assisting the Premier on the status of women or the Attorney General have read the harrowing account by Kirsty Robinson, as reported in the *Sydney Morning Herald* on 3rd October, who described her ordeal since being raped on 16th April, 1991, near Ballarat.

Though the offence occurred in Victoria, the victim came from Sydney. Police from both Victoria and New South Wales were involved in the hunt for the rapist and the

eventual trial. The trial concluded in September and the rapist received only a two-year gaol term and an additional eight months for attempting to pervert the course of justice. Has the Attorney General or the Minister followed that particular case and extrapolated from it the many similar experiences of women who are victims of rape? Is the Minister or the Attorney General aware of the damning criticism that the Government has already

Page 6932
received since the Minister announced a fortnight ago in this House the phone-in for victims of sexual assault and rape? I draw the attention of the Minister and of other members of the House to the *Sydney Morning Herald* editorial and an article in today's edition of the *Daily Telegraph-Mirror* which highlight the fact that it is very likely that this particular rape phone-in will be interpreted by the women of New South Wales as a trivialisation of the reform of rape laws and the effectiveness of pursuing rapists in this State.

The resources provided in this Budget for domestic violence services are no match for the rhetoric of the Minister assisting the Premier on women's affairs. In her preface to the women's budget statement she identified domestic violence as a priority. On 21st September, on behalf of the Premier, she launched the report of the Domestic Violence Advocacy Service. The report reviewed the first five years of the Domestic Violence Advocacy Service's operation - from 1986 to 1991. The Minister endorsed the findings of an independent evaluation of the service. She said:

The results of the research affirm that the Domestic Violence Advocacy Service is working well, women are pleased with the service they receive, and that the Advocacy Service is successful in its applications for apprehended violence orders. Women also indicated that they would use the service again if domestic violence was again to become an issue in their lives.

She highlighted the report's conclusion and said:

Overall, the results indicate that the Domestic Violence Advocacy Service successfully meets its goals . . . and is working effectively and efficiently.

Obviously the Domestic Violence Advocacy Service has had a high success rate with the 6,163 clients who contacted the service for assistance between November 1986 and December 1991. This is indeed a service that deserves the Minister's ringing endorsement. But more importantly this service deserves increased funding to at least match the rate of inflation in this State, yet the Budget Papers show that 21 legal centres in this State, including the Women's Legal Resources Centre and Domestic Violence Advocacy Service, received no increase in funding. In the 1991-92 financial year these centres received just over \$2.5 million and in the 1992-93 Budget Papers the same amount was allocated by the Legal Aid Commission and the Fahey Government. I note that in 1991-92 community legal centres spending ran over budget by approximately 25 per cent. It is a welcome overexpenditure because it indicates that women are responding to the calls from governments - State and Federal - to report domestic violence. But this year the Domestic Violence Advocacy Service and its sister organisation the Women's Legal Resources Centre will have fewer funds available to meet the continuing and, by the Government's own admission, increasing demand for their services by victims of domestic violence.

There is no doubt that the client base for these services will increase during the next year. One of the major aims of the domestic violence campaign currently being waged by the Government is to encourage the victims of domestic violence to come forward to the police and such advisory services as the Domestic Violence Advocacy Service, which was praised by the Minister. In the vital area of educating police about

domestic violence and sexual assault this Government has actually cut services. The domestic violence co-ordinator and the sexual assault co-ordinator within the Police Service will each receive \$69,209 compared to \$69,365 last year to develop and monitor domestic violence policies and ensure adequate services for victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. Despite its rhetoric the Government is spending less on legal assistance for the victims of sexual assault and domestic violence.

Page 6933

What is the Government doing about support services for these same women? The Budget Papers for community services show a freeze in community grants for adolescents under stress or in crisis, young people, and families under stress or in crisis. Specifically the women's emergency service program, which provides funds to non-government organisations to provide women's refuges, medium-term supported accommodation and longer-term accommodation for homeless women and children including single women and women escaping domestic violence, has been frozen. Funding has actually decreased. Total funding for this program has fallen from \$19.24 million to \$18.445 million, a decrease of three quarters of a million dollars. This includes not only a cut in State funding of \$377,000 but also a decline in Commonwealth funding of \$418,000, which should also be noted.

I further note that the Commonwealth has announced a new program under the joint Commonwealth-State housing assistance program - the community housing program. Housing funding under this program will provide regionally and locally responsive housing for disadvantaged people on low incomes. It will directly provide for housing and housing-related needs, particularly those of women. It is hoped that New South Wales will make full use of this initiative and that the current Minister for Housing does not emulate his predecessor, who was notorious for underspending in that area. Legal assistance for victims of rape, sexual assault, domestic violence, housing and other support services for women in crisis have been cut by this Government despite the Government's rhetoric. How has this Budget affected the health needs of these women? This Government, the Minister assisting the Premier on women's affairs, and the Minister for Health continually refer to their performances with regard to women's health. Mammography screening has certainly had an increase in expenditure in 1992-93, but that spending only offsets the very low State funding received by the program last financial year. This program is federally driven also and fulfils Federal Labor's 1990 election promise.

However, non-government women's health services in rural and metropolitan New South Wales have been cut in this Budget. These services include women's health centres, family planning, pregnancy counselling, sexual assault and domestic violence. Funding has decreased by \$326,000; a State reduction of \$232,000 or almost one quarter of a million dollars, and a Commonwealth reduction of \$94,000. Other important health services for women, such as funding for women's health education officers, women's health co-ordinators on area health boards and gynaecological health services for well women have also been frozen at last year's levels. On 30th September in a press release the Minister assisting the Premier on women's affairs made a dramatic point when she criticised the Leader of the Opposition for failing to mention women in his budgetary comments. In the coming financial year new facilities will be available for women in Liverpool but the Minister failed to mention that when the Sisters of Charity take over the Liverpool Hospital - which is currently the Government's intention - important gynaecological services, particularly terminations of pregnancy, will no longer be carried out at that particular facility. The Minister for Health has already confirmed this fact, and he has indicated that though terminations will not be performed at Liverpool Hospital

under the administration of the Sisters of Charity other facilities will be provided in the area for that particular procedure. Unfortunately, there is no budget allocation for those services and no indication where that money will come from.

The Minister assisting the Premier on women's affairs and the Premier must be acutely embarrassed about the amount of money that is being provided for women in this Budget. The Minister assisting the Premier on women's affairs, the Hon. Ann Cohen, has responsibility for the Women's Co-ordination Unit, yet funding for this unit in the
Page 6934

coming financial year has been cut by \$54,000. One of former Premier Greiner's most reprehensible public policy initiatives was to transfer the Women's Co-ordination Unit from the Premier's Department to the portfolio of a convenient female ministerial colleague - first the Hon. Virginia Chadwick and now the Hon. Ann Cohen. The current Premier has continued this practice. On Labor's return to government in this State, the Women's Co-ordination Unit will return to the administration of the Premier's Department. [*Extension of time agreed to.*]

In other important areas the Fahey Government's performance over the next 12 months will disappoint women. Funding for girls' and women's education programs is minuscule. In school education only half a million dollars has been allocated for curriculum strategies from kindergarten to year 12. There is no policy development role in the Ministry of Education for girls and women, unlike during the many years of the Wran and Unsworth administrations, when the social development unit played a vital role in that area. The Board of Studies has been allocated half the salary of a senior education officer - approximately \$26,000 - to study gender equity and girls' education strategies. Most of this budget allocation will be spent on a statement of values and a statement of principles that the Board of Studies is developing. Big deal! There is no specific allocation for status of women teacher programs in the human resource program, although \$40 million has been allocated in the Budget for that program.

In technical and further education the women's education and training strategy is a farce. In 1991-92, 109 colleges had women's strategy officers working for up to three hours a week on developing that strategy. No expenditure has been reflected in the Budget Papers for officers in the next financial year. Similarly, courses designed to increase women's participation in technical and further education will be dependent on course planning and priority, which is yet to be determined, and may not eventuate in the next calendar year. Any increases in the area of TAFE are largely as a consequence of Federal funding. Although the women's budget statement does not show this, Federal recurrent TAFE funding rose 35 per cent this financial year to \$102 million. Obviously a great deal of work still needs to be done in promoting TAFE courses for women, in particular, in non-traditional occupations and courses. In the next financial year, TAFE will spend only \$24,100 on marketing its courses for women. That is down from almost \$30,000 in the last financial year. That would buy about one paragraph in an advertisement in the *Sydney Morning Herald* to try to attract women students into TAFE courses.

Even in sport women's programs are being underfunded. There are no specific women's sporting programs but, in certain programs where women predominate, cuts have been experienced. The walking for pleasure program, which has a 75 per cent women's participation rate, has been frozen. But programs targeting talented athletes and elite sports squads, where women's participation is 40 per cent and 38 per cent respectively, have had an increase in funds. Why is there no program seeking to increase women's participation at the elite levels of State sport? Why is New South Wales falling behind in the implementation of the Australian women in sport and recreation strategy

launched in July this year by the Federal Government in conjunction with the States? I am disappointed that the Minister for Sport, Recreation and Racing is no longer in the Chamber because I would like his answer on that issue. Aboriginal women get one policy development officer to advise across all portfolios in the State and to establish a statewide network of Aboriginal women. The top equal employment opportunity job in this State has been vacant since April 1992. The reference in the Budget Papers to the Director of Equal Opportunity in Public Employment demonstrates that only slices of consultancies will be provided in 1992-93. For example, there will be an allocation for

Page 6935
the impact of equal employment opportunity on human resources management. Only \$13,000 will be spent on trying to educate the senior executive service about the needs of equal employment opportunity.

It is the Year of the Family in 1994, yet only a small proportion of money will be spent by the Director of Equal Opportunity in Public Employment on flexible work practices, and \$17,000 will be allocated to that major priority of the Government - enterprise bargaining and its relevance to equal employment opportunity. Similarly, only small amounts will be spent on rural employment for Aborigines and on recruitment strategies for the disabled. The Office of Public Management, which is responsible for "changing the culture of the New South Wales Government service to one which has a great capacity to accept risks and successfully manage change" has several programs relating to equal employment opportunity for women, but unfortunately its total budget allocation is very poor. That favoured son, the Premier's Department, has \$6 million to spend, but of that it will spend \$21,000 on increased work force flexibility, which covers issues such as part-time work, flexible work practices and child care. Last year, this Government was to spend \$24,600 on the important issue of merit. There is no budget allocation for next year, so perhaps merit will disappear completely from the agenda of the Office of Public Management.

This Government will be spending a measly \$15,000 on completing a women's register. This is a significant increase on what was spent last year. Last year the Government spent only \$2,000. That is a sizeable increase, but it is really a pathetic amount. The Government will probably find that all it needs to do is to go through those women's registers that were successfully kept by the previous Wran and Unsworth governments from 1976 onwards to establish whether it can get women who are worthy of promotion to convince the Minister and senior staff of the Minister, which is what the function of the register will be. One of the jewels in the crown of the Budget Papers so far as women are concerned can be found in the budgetary estimates for New South Wales Agriculture. A rural women's network has been established, which I believe is a much overdue initiative. Last year the department praised its performance in agricultural education, which confirmed women's participation in sex stereotype vocations such as farm office management and farm computing. This year, \$260,000 has been allocated for a rural women's network, but there is some confusion about the role of the network. The Minister for Agriculture, in an attachment to the Budget Papers, stated that rural counselling services and a rural women's network co-ordinator were high priorities on the department's agenda to help counter the effects of the rural downturn on families. The Deputy Premier, in his contribution to the budget debate, was far more folksy about the issue. He said:

This will provide support and advice for rural families. One of the problems in country New South Wales is the inability of people to be able to get that little bit of personal advice through the rural counselling scheme or through the women's programs where they can sit down quietly in the full knowledge that their discussions are totally confidential and they can pour out their hearts to somebody and find the best solutions available.

More jam and scones please, Daph, and pass the tissues. Officially, the network is designed to link rural women with existing rural services, resources and groups; give them a voice to develop communications networks which will involve and inform them; and identify priority issues, and develop strategies for dealing with them. But this is the single largest amount that the current Government has decided to spend on new women's services this year. I assure honourable members that the Opposition will watch the expenditure of this money closely and will watch the performance of the rural women's network. A disappointing omission from the women's budget statement and from the

Page 6936

Budget generally has been the lack of emphasis on women and the community planning process. I do have responsibility for planning but generally I am disappointed that even today there is no emphasis on women in the planning process within the New South Wales Department of Planning. There is some light at the end of the tunnel because the Federal Government's building better cities program, which has been allocated more than \$800 million, will specifically target areas where women, particularly on the fringes of western and southwestern Sydney, have had difficulty in making the cities in which they live responsive to their needs. Women will benefit from the social outcomes of the building better cities program, such as improved housing affordability and choice, and from the proposed housing being better matched to the location of jobs and services, including hospitals and child care. That is one bonus of the better cities program. I am disappointed that it will be abolished by Dr Hewson. [*Time expired.*]

Mr HARTCHER (Gosford - Minister for the Environment) [9.43]: I speak on the Fahey Government's first Budget. The Fahey Government is a government of achievement despite these times of recession. I was disappointed to hear the shadow minister for the environment speak for half an hour with not one mention of the environment. She is totally consistent with her leader, who also spoke for half an hour with only one line on the environment; that was to rip \$40 million out of the environmental trust scheme so that people could not receive grants under the scheme. That is the total involvement of the Opposition in the environment - not a word from the shadow minister; and only a single line from the Leader of the Opposition. It proves the truth of the remark made today by the Director of the Total Environment Centre of New South Wales, Mr Milo Dunphy, that the Opposition's environmental credibility is in shreds. If ever a political party has taken a downturn on the environment, it is the Australian Labor Party - at a time when the Premier has introduced a budget referred to by the *Sydney Morning Herald* as a green budget with a 25 per cent increase in spending on the environment.

No wonder the ALP does not want to mention it - a 25 per cent increase in a time of economic recession; a sign of the total commitment of this Government to environmental protection in this State. The proud record of my predecessor, the Hon. Tim Moore, and the former Premier, the Hon. Nick Greiner, is being extended and developed under the great leadership of John Fahey. It gives me pleasure as Minister for the Environment to prove the green credentials of the Fahey Government in this speech. This is a green budget, and I am sure honourable members on both sides have had the opportunity to study the Budget Papers and will agree that the Premier has recognised the importance of the environment to the people of New South Wales. In this financial year the Government will provide \$52.1 million towards the operating costs of the Environment Protection Authority. A further \$6.3 million will be devoted to capital works and \$2.8 million will be carried over from 1991-92 capital funds. Expenditure on the Environment Protection Authority is something like 40 per cent more than in the bankrupt former Labor State of Victoria. Labor is as weak in Opposition as it was in government on the environment.

The Government will provide \$500,000 for the Co-operative Research Centre for Waste Management and Pollution Control and \$100,000 to the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation as a continuation of its five-year commitment to refine climate models and generate climate change predictions for regions within New South Wales. More than \$250,000 in staff resources will be spent on developing an economic information database. Approximately \$300,000 will be directed to the preparation of the first state of the environment report, including a public discussion paper. The Government is determined to ensure full public accountability and

Page 6937
will publish next year, as provided for in the Protection of the Environment Administration Act stage one, a full environmental audit of the State of New South Wales - the first time any Government has had the courage and the commitment to do so. A further \$150,000 in costs will be allocated to the establishment and administration of four statutory community consultation forums to obtain community input into EPA programs.

The EPA will establish an education committee and a program to develop policies and strategies on environmental education at a cost of \$240,000. An initial amount of \$106,000 has been allocated to support community-based environment groups. In 1992-93 the EPA has the honour of serving as the Chair of the Standing Committee for the Australian New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council, ANZECC, to which some \$200,000 in resources has been allocated. The first meeting under my chairmanship will take place on 6th November in Sydney. The issue of waste is perhaps the most urgent environmental issue to confront us. I have tonight moved the establishment of a joint standing committee to examine the green paper introduced by the Government, which will be a hallmark of change in waste management in New South Wales. In the 1992-93 Budget the Government has allocated \$5.5 million to waste minimisation activities, which will include \$2.6 million to local government councils under the council recycling rebate scheme - another success instituted by my predecessor, the Hon. Tim Moore; \$700,000 to promote establishment of a materials recovery facility to process mixed recyclable materials; and waste minimisation projects at an estimated cost of \$1.7 million.

My predecessor has set in train a process which will ensure that Sydney becomes to Australia what Seattle is to the United States - a beacon of successful waste management. Approximately \$3.5 million will be devoted to the management of chemicals, hazardous waste and radiation. An additional \$250,000 will be directed to research and development projects in waste minimisation undertaken by industry and universities relating to hazardous substances. Another \$250,000 will be spent on a geographic information system for contaminated sites. A further \$2.5 million will be spent on laboratory services to support the EPA's enforcement, monitoring and research activities. Another \$6 million will be spent over the next two to three years to bring the EPA's laboratory facilities up to standard. With the commissioning of the deep water outfalls, the EPA's environmental monitoring program, together with the extended Beachwatch program, will play a vital role in controlling the effluent going into our waterways.

The environmental monitoring program will examine oceanography, plume dispersion, water quality and the effects on marine life with the accumulation of pollutants in edible fish species at a cost of approximately \$5 million. Our beaches today are cleaner than they have ever been - a tribute once again to the successful introduction of policies under this Government. Approximately \$2 million will be directed to inland water and catchment management. The Budget has also allowed \$5 million for air quality monitoring programs, which I had the privilege to announce in

greater detail to the House in question time this afternoon. Air quality monitoring programs will include an air quality measurement and development control strategy at a cost of \$430,000; a metropolitan air quality study incorporating the development of a new monitoring network - a total cost estimated at \$4 million, of which \$3.25 million will be spent this year. In compliance with the Government's responsibilities under the Montreal Convention, New South Wales will spend \$260,000 on ozone layer protection and \$180,000 on a control program for biomedical waste incinerators.

Page 6938

About \$16 million will be spent during the year on controlling pollution. The Environment Protection Authority will continue to develop a comprehensive review of licensing systems. Considerable effort will continue to be put into prosecutions and the issuing of penalty notices. There will be an increased emphasis on prevention, including support for total catchment management committees, education programs and an increased participation in the development consent process. The Opposition, however, has confirmed that it does not support community involvement in environmental matters and has in fact brought into question its commitment to the concepts of the Environment Protection Authority, a body whose establishment is without doubt one of the most important environmental achievements in this State for many years. I say that the Opposition has no commitment because of the statement by the Leader of the Opposition that he would destroy the environmental trust system, which this year provided almost \$2.4 million to 63 community-based environmental projects across the State.

If the Leader of the Opposition had his way, projects in the electorates of Auburn, Georges River, Bulli, Liverpool and Kiama would be abandoned. If he had his way, the restoration of swamp woodland in Bankstown would stop, funding to the reverse garbage truck co-operative at Marrickville would dry up, and the restoration of the wetland reserve at Salt Pan Creek would be an illusion. I wonder how the honourable member for Londonderry would feel if the restoration of Wilberforce Reach was no longer funded, or how the honourable member for Kogarah would react if the swamp at Leo Smith Reserve at Ramsgate had to remain as it is. All of those projects would cease if the Leader of the Opposition had his way. In his one line statement on the Budget he ripped the guts out of the environmental trusts.

Mr Photios: One line Carr, one per cent Carr.

Mr HARTCHER: Mr Carr is minus 3 per cent. The Government, on the other hand, has made an outstanding environmental commitment, not just in the budget for the Environment Protection Authority but for all agencies under my portfolio, including the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Peats to order.

Mr HARTCHER: The Government will provide \$37 million to meet the operating costs of the National Parks and Wildlife Service during the 1992-93 year. A further amount of \$22.3 million will be available for capital works and land acquisition to extend the national park estate. The following projects within the National Parks and Wildlife Service will be funded in 1992-93: \$304,000 to assist in the addition of Fort Denison and Goat Island to the service's estate; Myall Lakes National Park will receive \$346,000 to continue the improvement of roads and visitor facilities. The metropolitan parks improvement program will continue, with Royal National Park being allocated \$290,000, Ku-ring-gai National Park \$218,000; Blue Mountains National Park \$576,000; and Sydney Harbour National Park \$631,000. Also, \$390,000 has been allocated to

continue the development of the Yengo National Park, and \$293,000 has been provided for the development of Wyrabalong National Park. In addition, \$163,000 has been provided to continue the development of Garigal National Park, and \$4.4 million has been provided for continued maintenance and improvements to the road network within the Kosciusko National Park. To provide for a better park system the Government is to purchase land. Approximately \$2.2 million will be made available for important acquisitions by the service this year. The service will be provided with a further \$350,000 to purchase fire suppression equipment this year, and an additional \$500,000 will also be available for fire management programs.

Page 6939

An allocation of \$350,000 has been made for pest species management programs within the park areas, and \$45,000 has been provided to the service to continue its co-operative program with the Zoological Parks Board with the aim of successfully breeding and releasing the endangered mallee fowl. The service will be provided with a further \$120,000 this year to meet the costs of assessing the conservation values of wilderness areas. The National Parks and Wildlife Service has been allocated \$210,000 for the development and implementation of natural and cultural heritage strategies. A further \$487,000 has been provided for a number of other cultural heritage conservation projects, and \$420,000 for other natural heritage projects. Other agencies also have been winners in this first Fahey budget, the green budget. The National Parks and Wildlife Service throughout the year will provide a further \$50,000 to the National Parks and Wildlife Foundation's administration. It will provide also \$10,000 to the Wildlife Information Rescue Service - WIRES. The Government has voted the Biological Board \$3.9 million, supplemented by corporate sponsorships and research grants. It will focus on preservation and conservation of endangered species, improvements to management of wildlife and public education.

In relation to zoos, \$432,000 will be spent on research into taxonomy, ecology and improved management of several native vertebrate species, and \$100,000 will be spent on the construction of a predator-proof sanctuary at Western Plains Zoo in which very rare species of native fauna will be maintained and bred under free range conditions to help preserve their species. The board will spend \$651,000 in an effort to save the black rhino. A large facility for breeding the species will be established at Western Plains Zoo. Ten animals will be imported from Zimbabwe under an agreement between that country and the International Black Rhino Foundation. In relation to the Royal Botanic Gardens the Government will provide \$12.2 million for operating costs, which will include the operations of the Sydney gardens in the Domain, the natural herbarium, and Mount Annan and Mount Tomah Botanic Gardens. The Government also is providing specific capital funds for restoration of the Botanic Garden's old display glasshouse built in 1874; increased security at both Mount Tomah and Mount Annan Botanic Gardens; installation of a fire abatement system at Mount Tomah Botanic Gardens; and re-roofing of the brown building which houses the natural herbarium of New South Wales. In regard to Bicentennial Park the Government will provide funding for extensions to the maintenance depot at a cost of \$175,000; doubling of the barbecue facilities at a cost of \$65,000; construction of the bird viewing enclosure at a cost of \$45,000; and completion of a wetlands visitor centre at a cost of \$26,000. Total Government funding for Bicentennial Park for the upcoming year will be \$1.3 million. Having visited Bicentennial Park last Sunday I should congratulate its director, Mr Robert Crewes, and the trusts under Mr Peter Cox for the excellent work they have done in making this magnificent facility available for the people of western Sydney. Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust is responsible for managing the historic cultural, recreation and environmentally significant urban parkland known as Centennial Park, together with

Queens Park and Moore Park. In 1992-93 the Government will provide \$3.3 million towards the operating costs of those parks. It will make available also \$402,000 towards the redevelopment of Moore Park golf course, which is the busiest public golf course in Australia. [*Extension of time agreed to.*]

In regard to that golf course \$600,000 will be provided for a long-term program to install automatic irrigation to improve both turf quality and water efficiency; \$250,000 for soft landscape work within Moore Park; and \$225,000 for heritage conservation work within Centennial Park. The trust will spend \$90,000 on park planning and visitor research programs, the most important of those being the development of a strategic plan. The Government has shown a commitment to the environment which is unequalled in
Page 6940

New South Wales. Not only has it increased funding by 25 per cent, but there has been an increase in the staffing of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, an increase in the staffing of the Environment Protection Authority, an increase in money made available to both agencies and a determination to ensure that at every level the environment in the State is protected, preserved and enhanced in a way that has been unequalled. This first Budget of the Fahey Government is indeed a green budget.

I congratulate the Government on its ability to provide financial support to non-metropolitan areas. The Gosford sewerage scheme has been allocated \$9.9 million. Since 1988 the State Government has contributed \$564 million to the Central Coast's water and sewerage program. Total funding for capital works for schools in the Gosford electorate is \$4.4 million. Each year schools in the Gosford electorate improve, unlike the legacy left to me in 1988 with run-down schools and decrepit classrooms. I was delighted that the New South Wales health budget increased to \$4.63 billion. An additional \$21 million in recurrent funds has been allocated to Gosford and Wyong hospitals. Upgrading those hospitals has cost \$70 million, and an additional \$21 million has been allocated so that more Central Coast residents may be treated in new and improved hospital facilities. Hospital facilities now available to the people of Gosford, Wyong and the rest of the Central Coast are among the best in Australia, with new extensions opened at Gosford and Wyong hospitals. This growth area now has first-class facilities and I am delighted this has been achieved in my term as the honourable member for Gosford.

The Central Coast Area Health Service continues to do a first-class job in the administration of health services. A further allocation of \$470,000 has been made to Gosford hospital for cardiac and ultrasound telemetry equipment and \$200,000 for monitoring equipment at its accident and emergency unit. This will ensure that the hospital is kept at the forefront of medical technology, in line with the \$43 million extension which earlier this year was opened proudly by the Minister for Health. Since 1988 the coalition has increased funding to the Central Coast Area Health Service by an amazing 53 per cent - a remarkable achievement, given Labor's recession. The electorate rightly expects this funding to continue. My interest in Gosford District Hospital is not equalled by other members on the Central Coast.

This financial year in my electorate a total of \$2.9 million will be spent on road construction, maintenance, traffic management and road safety. An allocation of \$1.3 million is being spent on Avoca Drive. That is a significant contribution to this important road in the Kincumber and Green Point areas, with \$800,000 of that figure to be spent on widening and duplication of Avoca Drive, and \$513,000 to be spent on the general upgrading of Avoca Drive between the Entrance Road and Avoca Beach. Also, major roadworks continue at West Gosford. Once again this is as a result of my representations. I am pleased that the roadworks are continuing. The area on the flat at

West Gosford is now open and is proving satisfactory. That project was costly to the Government but is well worth while and much appreciated by the residents of the Central Coast. The new expressway from Kariong to West Gosford should be opened by the end of this year. Work is proceeding satisfactorily and the people of Gosford will be delighted when that facility is open. It is long overdue and was totally ignored by the previous Labor Government.

As Minister for the Environment and as the honourable member for Gosford speaking on this first Fahey Budget, a truly green budget, I am delighted to have had the opportunity to highlight what can be achieved by a well managed Government focused on people, with a determination to improve quality of life. I mention also the new
Page 6941

railway station under construction at Gosford. This facility will provide a new car and bus interchange. The railway station will be completely reconstructed with a parking facility to accommodate 720 cars. This is at a total cost of more than \$14 million and a considerable step towards improving rail services for people on the Central Coast. Those rail services are excellent, punctual, clean and efficient. This again is a tribute to the determination of the Minister for Transport to ensure excellent rail services.

At every level this Government is conscious of the needs of the people of the Central Coast and conscious of their representation by their local member and a determination to maintain the area's beauty. Booti Booti National Park continues to be a jewel in the crown with further extensions planned at Old Maitland Bay House. Facilities are under way for the establishment of Wambine Nature Reserve and extensions under way for Wyrabalong National Park and recently proclaimed extensions for Wamberal Lagoon. At every level the Government is looking after the environment on the Central Coast. Its beaches remain beautiful and clean.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Peats to order for the second time.

Mr HARTCHER: Recently I, with the Deputy Premier, visited and viewed further and final extensions to the sewerage program, which is one of the best in the State and ensures that my electorate has lovely clean beaches. This green budget demonstrates the Fahey Government's commitment to the environment and I am proud to commend it to the House.

Mr HUNTER (Lake Macquarie) [10.6]: In speaking on the Budget I wish to spend the time allocated to me outlining how the Budget affects residents of the Lake Macquarie electorate. First, I acknowledge that the Budget provides benefits to my electorate. However, after perusing the Budget Papers I am of the view that the benefits given fall way short of what is deserved by the people of my electorate. I congratulate the Government on allocating funds to complete the construction of the new Bonnells Bay public school. In the 12 months since I was elected to this Parliament I have been in consultation with the Minister for School Education and consulted the school community on the best location for this school. I attended a meeting at the school with the Minister and spoke to the parent body. We visited a site further down the Morisset peninsula owned by the Department of Education. We discussed the possibility of locating the new school on that site. To the Minister's credit she listened to the wishes of the parents who asked for the new school to be developed on the existing school site.

A few weeks ago I visited Bonnells Bay public school and viewed plans of the new school. It will be an excellent facility and I congratulate the Government for continuing through with those funds. However, the Budget ignored completely the

desperate need of the Barnsley community for a new school. Last year in my first speech in this House I raised the needs of the Barnsley community, pointing out that the school now consists of 11 demountable buildings. The school is located on a clay pan, which is really a flood plain. With every shower of rain the school floods. Over the past 12 months the Government has expended some funds in an effort to alleviate that problem and has involved the former soil conservation service. However, the only answer is a new school. When I read the Budget Papers I was amazed that further money had not been allocated for even the planning stage of a new school at Barnsley. This appears to contradict the Minister's answers in response to questions on notice when she stated that construction of the school had been reviewed and had been nominated for capital works funding for a 14 core replacement school at an estimated cost of \$3.5 million.

Page 6942

Unfortunately, no funds have been made available in the Budget. I appeal to the Minister and the Government to make funds available now for planning of a new school to commence and in the next Budget for construction to commence.

Still on education: when I contributed to the debate on last year's budget I spoke about the dangerous condition of the retaining wall at Toronto Public School. Today the wall is leaning at an ever increasing dangerous angle, and the parents of the children are becoming quite worried the wall will actually give way and fall. Though the Minister has given me assurances in the past that something will be done about it, it is now six months since those assurances were given and nothing has been done. I appeal to the Minister to look again at the matter and ensure that work commences immediately to rectify the problem. Further on education: my electorate is in desperate need of a TAFE facility. At Toronto in the Lake Macquarie electorate there is an annexe of Glendale TAFE College, but it offers few courses. More courses must be available. The population is growing rapidly on the western side of Lake Macquarie; the latest census identifies it as the fastest growing area in the Hunter region. I ask the Minister to re-assess the establishment of a west lakes TAFE facility. Land for that purpose is available and the Hunter Institute is eager for such a facility to be developed on the western side of Lake Macquarie.

Yet again the Government has failed to recognise the need for a public hospital facility in the Lake Macquarie electorate. For some time I have been campaigning for the provision of a polyclinic or small public hospital on the western side. The previous Labor Government committed itself to building such a facility at a cost of almost \$2 million but, unfortunately, upon the election of the Greiner Government that commitment was ignored. Again in this Budget there has been no recognition that a community and public health facility is required in the region. What is needed is a 24-hour casualty ward. It is outrageous that an area like Lake Macquarie has no casualty facility of any kind. We need public hospital beds. The John Hunter Hospital at Rankin Park is an excellent facility but it is too far from the people who reside on the western side of Lake Macquarie. In an emergency the options for those people are either to travel to Wyong or to the new John Hunter Hospital - both facilities being approximately 40 minutes travel away.

Two months ago the Minister for Health made a commitment to increase the manning of ambulances in the Lake Macquarie electorate. The inadequacy of one-man ambulances on the western side of Lake Macquarie has been raised a number of times. After a review was undertaken by the Ambulance Service the Minister agreed to increase the manning at the Cooranbong Ambulance Station from seven ambulance officers to 12 - an increase of five officers. However, that Ambulance Service review also recommended an increase of three officers at the Toronto station from seven to 10; three

ambulance officers, from seven to 10, at Cardiff; at Belmont on the eastern side of Lake Macquarie an increase of two, from 12 officers to 14; and at Doyalson on the southern shores an increase of four, from seven to 11. The Minister announced that staffing at Cooranbong would be increased by November, but as yet no moves have been made to increase staff numbers at other stations. The Minister is quite aware that two ambulance officers are needed in ambulances at all times. I ask him to give serious consideration to meeting the commitment detailed in the staff review document, which recommended that staff at other ambulance stations be increased.

I now wish to refer to the Morisset Hospital. For the members who are not aware, Morisset Hospital is located on almost 2,000 hectares of Department of Health land and is what could be called a dual facility. During the 1980s the psychiatric

Page 6943

hospital, as it was then, was split in two. Half of the buildings were occupied by the Department of Community Services where the Kanangra Centre was set up to specifically look after people with developmental disabilities, while the Department of Health retained control of the other buildings and continued its mental health work. The Budget refers to an allocation for the completion of a new medium-security unit to house violent mentally ill patients at Morisset. The total cost of that unit is in the vicinity of \$7 million. I congratulate the Government on allocating those funds for that purpose. At present those who will occupy the new medium-security unit are housed in ward 14. Anyone who visits the hospital will acknowledge that the unit must be replaced.

What is the future of Morisset Hospital? It seems the Government is giving conflicting signals. One month ago ward 9 became the tenth ward to close at the hospital. The laundry services have been privatised and the management of the Hunter Area Health Service has indicated to staff that the hospital will close. An excellent article in the *Newcastle Herald* of 26th September, entitled "Morisset Hospital to Close by 2000", written by Nathan Vass, political reporter for that paper based at Parliament House, reported:

Morisset Hospital will be closed by the year 2000 as the Hunter Area Health Service runs down services there in the next few years, according to Mr Hunter. Mr Hunter said yesterday that the health service administrator, Dr Smyth, had told him the hospital would be run down and eventually closed.

Dr Smyth had also revealed the cancellation of further investment in a new admissions unit.

Hospital management had unofficially told staff the hospital would be closed by 2000 and Dr Smyth had said it would be closed by 2010.

Either way, the Government's going to close it, Mr Hunter said.

He said the Government had already moved in that direction by closing a ward last week and by now trying to remove the Department of Community Services -

The department rents part of the site for the Kanangra Centre, which cares for intellectually disabled people and not the mentally ill people treated at Morisset Hospital.

Mr Hunter believes the health service is trying to demand higher rent from the department, rent it cannot afford to pay.

But the acting health service administrator, Mr Ken Miller, said Dr Smyth's comments

about the closure of the hospital would have been meant to indicate a long-term gradual change that would take place.

He said that in the past 20 years alone the number of patients at Morisset had fallen from 1400 to 200 . . .

Eventually, large mental health institutions such as Morisset would be phased out.

But there's no need for patients and staff to be upset by this because it is a long-term matter, Mr Miller said.

The health service also wanted to see mental health dealt with in the mainstream health area so it was considering the establishment of a psychiatric unit at the Mater Hospital.

People won't be put out into the street, Mr Miller said.

Mentally ill patients will not be put out into the street; they will be shoved into public hospitals, and Morisset Hospital, as we know it, will no longer exist. As I said, ward 9 became the tenth ward at Morisset Hospital to close; the main laundry was closed and
Page 6944

the service privatised; the area health service is now trying to close the Kanangra Centre and evict the Department of Community Services; and executives at the hospital have told staff unofficially that the facility will close by the year 2000. It seems the only section of the hospital that will be left operating will be the new medium-security unit. One wonders what the Government has planned for the site. I ask the Minister to inform the people of Lake Macquarie what is going on. What is planned for the site? If the Government has a plan, it must come clean and tell the people of Lake Macquarie what it is. The staff should know what is going on. Imagine how the staff at Kanangra and the hospital feel when they hear from the Hunter Area Health Service that the long-term plan is for the facility to close. Information I have received indicates that the Government is planning to establish a correctional facility on the site. Already existing is a vacant ward 21, which used to house the criminally insane. Those inmates have been transferred to Long Bay. Of course, we do have the existing medium-security unit, and a new medium-security facility is under construction.

What is going on? Does the Government plan to set up a prison farm, or a medium-security prison, or will it set up a facility for the criminally insane or for those with developmental disabilities who are now placed in the mainstream prison system? The people of my electorate would like to know what is going on. Perhaps the Government would find agreement with the community if it would only tell the people what is happening. Such decisions affect the livelihood of people in my electorate. The hospital is one of the major employers in my electorate and any effect on it will in turn have an effect on the economy of west Lake Macquarie. I turn now to the provision of a court house at Toronto. No funds were allocated in this Budget for the construction of a court house at Toronto. That is an amazing state of affairs given that the Government has spent \$240,000 of taxpayers' money to draw up plans for the two-court complex. In fact the plans have been passed by a number of government authorities - the Mine Subsidence Board and the fire service - and in 1989 were submitted for approval to the Lake Macquarie City Council. Over the past three years no funds have been allocated for the construction of the court house. However, I note in the Budget that \$408,000 has been allocated to draw up plans for a police and court complex at Tamworth. There is already a court house and a police station at Tamworth but the Government will build a new one. I did not understand the reason for that.

While reading some old newspaper clippings I came across a story about the Greiner-Windsor letter and how the previous Premier had come to an agreement with the Independent member for Tamworth to build a new police and court complex in Tamworth to secure his vote in Parliament. Maybe that is the reason that \$408,000 has been allocated to provide a new court and police complex in Tamworth, although such facilities already exist. The western side of Lake Macquarie, and Toronto in particular, has been overlooked. As I have said, \$240,000 has been spent to draw up plans for a court that the Government does not plan to proceed with. I suggest that the Government reconsider that decision because I do not believe that the people of New South Wales are happy about money being wasted. Government members claim to be great economic managers, yet they seem to be happy to forget about \$240,000 that has been spent on plans that are likely to be discarded.

With regard to transport, I congratulate the Government on the allocation of funds for improvements to railway stations in the Lake Macquarie electorate. I am pleased that the Minister has taken notice of the numerous letters and petitions I have presented to him in the Parliament and direct to his office. Allocations have been made for improvements to Dora Creek railway station where a new staircase is to be constructed to provide access to the station. Funds have been allocated for the

Page 6945

construction of a new overhead bridge at Awaba. At Fassifern the railway station will be expanded and a canopy cover provided. Funds are to be allocated for a new waiting room at Booragul. I am pleased about that as two senior citizens' villages are located adjacent to the station. The previous shelter was demolished after the earthquake that occurred in Newcastle more than 2½ years ago. At Teralba improvements will be made with the construction of a new staircase, and at Cockle Creek new shelters are to be provided.

Though I thank the Minister for Transport for those allocations of funds, I have to remind him of a matter that he has overlooked. In January a new timetable was introduced in the Hunter region that affected a number of services to west Lake Macquarie railway stations. Fassifern railway station lost 44 services a day because the Minister axed the suburban service from Newcastle. That service was replaced by the Newcastle to Sydney or Sydney to Newcastle trains. Platform No. 1 at the station was taken out of service, which meant that elderly people had to climb the stairs and make their way over the main northern rail line to catch a train to Newcastle. One issue not addressed in the Budget is the provision of access ramps at Fassifern and Morisset stations. There is a high senior citizen population in my electorate and I ask the Minister for Transport to consider this issue carefully and perhaps find funds within the next 12 months to provide the ramps. [*Extension of time agreed to.*]

Funds have been allocated in the Budget for the continuation of the Hunter sewerage project, which will result in the western side of Lake Macquarie being connected to the sewer. When that occurs, sewage will be piped under Lake Macquarie and discharged into the ocean off Belmont. I should point out that this scheme was introduced by the former Labor Government, which initiated funding for it. When the coalition came to office it continued the scheme, and I congratulate it on that. It has allocated funds to continue the expansion of that project. However, with regard to that project, specific areas are listed as priority one areas or priority two areas. Cooranbong, which is a large township on the western side of Lake Macquarie, has been put on the priority two list. The town is built around Dora Creek, which feeds directly into Lake Macquarie. Recently some independent tests on creek water within the vicinity of Cooranbong showed high E coli counts. The creek is polluted and the Government should be considering elevating Cooranbong from the priority two list to the priority one

list. That town must be connected to the sewerage system. I wait in the hope that funds will be left over from the scheme, as the Government has suggested, to be used for this purpose. If the scheme runs under budget, perhaps some priority two areas will be connected. I ask the Minister to give consideration to this matter. The creek is contaminated and, in turn, it is contaminating Lake Macquarie. It is a desperate situation, and the Minister must address the matter.

In the past few months a problem has arisen relating to sewer service access charges. The Hunter Water Corporation is charging residents a sewer access charge of \$2,848. It applies to land that receives a sewer service under the Hunter sewerage project and which was vacant as at 5th December, 1988. The charge is payable in full on application for connection to the scheme and is in addition to the standard fees, charges and plumbers' costs. Anyone who built a home after 5th December, 1988, will have to pay the fee of \$2,848 in order to be connected to the scheme. These people have already expended considerable sums of money having septic systems installed in their homes. Such systems cost about \$2,500 to \$3,000. I ask the Minister to examine this matter. As I said, it means that those who built their homes prior to 5th December, 1988, will not have to pay the access charge, whereas those who built after that date will be charged the fee though they have already paid for septic systems. Those systems, of

Page 6946

course, will be redundant once the homes are connected to the Hunter sewerage project. Consequently, it will cost those who built after 5th December, 1988, of the order of \$6,000 to be connected to the sewer, when one includes the initial cost of the septic system. Those who were living in their homes prior to that date will pay only the ordinary connection fee that a plumber charges.

Earlier in this debate the Minister for the Environment spoke about the Government's achievements. I ask him to consider seriously the notice of motion that I have on the notice paper to set up a select committee to inquire into the lead contamination problem in New South Wales. I am sure the Minister is aware of the problems that exist in my electorate with the Pasminco metals-sulphide smelter at Boolaroo, and I am sure he is aware that the Boolaroo public school has been closed for term 4. The yard and the buildings are contaminated with lead. The children who attend that school have been relocated to another school to enable the Department of School Education to decontaminate the school. It is a serious problem for the children living in my area, particularly the children who are mostly affected by high lead levels in their blood. I would ask the Minister to consider seriously the setting up of a select committee to investigate lead contamination in New South Wales and make recommendations to this Parliament on how that problem can be addressed. In conclusion I should like to point out that this Budget has run up a deficit of \$1.2 billion - a very disappointing result for a Government which claims to be a great economic manager. I sincerely hope for the people of Lake Macquarie that the Government can better manage the affairs of State during the next 12 months. Again I ask the Government to look closely at the issues I have raised affecting the Lake Macquarie electorate and I would ask that it act to resolve these problems.

Mr CRUICKSHANK (Murrumbidgee) [10.31]: I should like to take the opportunity of congratulating the Government on this Budget. I will not become involved in all the facts and figures; they have been analysed many times by many people. I should like to remind this House of the commitment made by the Premier in his Budget Speech to ensure services of a high standard, increase competition in the market-place, provide freedom of choice for consumers by removing Government monopolies, ensure that taxpayers receive value for money in the public sector and to be a responsible and understanding employer. This Budget was designed around those ideals.

I have seen many conservative governments make those commitments but unfortunately I do not believe they have ever really been adhered to nor did the government of the day intend adhering to them.

Those commitments are now an extension of the vision started by Mr Greiner in this State that was the vanguard for the whole of Australia. I am happy that Mr Fahey has continued where Mr Greiner left off and I hope that the Government will make an even greater commitment. Government trading enterprises in New South Wales are revolutionary for any part of Australia and it is definitely the direction in which we should be heading. When one contemplates the way in which New South Wales has been rehabilitated over the past five years by the former Greiner Government, now Fahey Government, combined with the way in which the Federal Labor Government has been consistently short changing the States - except those with whom it can do unfair and shonky deals - and the way in which this Government has managed its funds, its economy has been exemplary.

I do not think anyone would dispute that the unemployment figures - which are the greatest single comparison when dealing with other States of Australia - show that New South Wales is still in front. It has always been in front and it is the only State that

Page 6947

can do it because it started to make the moves in 1988 at the right time. This is all in spite of the fact that Australia is undergoing its worst recession in 60 years. That is a factor that cannot be reiterated too often. The only reason Australia is experiencing such dreadful times is the arrogance, incompetence and loss of direction of the Federal Government. The worst feature is that funds for public health, roads and education have been slashed in all quarters where the Federal Government has been unable to cut its own spending. The duplication of services by the Federal Government would more than cover the shortfall in State revenues, but instead of cutting its own expenditure, the Federal Government's only solution is to cut taxpayers' moneys owing to the States of Australia and in particular those States that are not Labor States.

Australia is being run by the elected Government of this country, which has more than demonstrated its inability to provide stable economic guidance - as if it could have done so in any event! The Federal Government has rendered this country prostrate. It will not make the essential structural changes but instead believes that it can keep trying to breathe - and talk with conflicting messages - some sort of life, some sort of vitality into a prostrate, moribund economy. The left hand does not know what the right is doing. New South Wales is not the only State pinned down by this handicap of escaping from the straitjacket of debt. The commitment to reduction of debt is one of the prime things Mr Fahey, the Premier, spoke of. Although New South Wales, with its vision, has done far better than any other State, debt affects the whole of Australia. All of the supporters of the present Federal regime stoutly protest that the rest of the world is in a worse state than Australia, as though that is some sort of absolution or excuse: "The rest of the world is doing it tough so we have to do the same thing". What absolute nonsense!

Australia is a young country, massively rich in resources. It has a small privileged population totally lacking in dangerous harmful community or population divisions; no domestic physical dangers of any consequence; no external threats from hostile neighbours; a stable consistent political system - not politicians, but the system - and just about every other desirable quality of life that could be imagined. Yet Australia is politically gutting and it is fast becoming the sick man of South-east Asia. The real trouble lies in the way that politicians believe they can wield some sort of meaningful and effective power. It is absolute nonsense that any government should think it is capable

of manipulating the economy by pulling a few levers and twiddling the knobs, a bit of fine tuning here and a bit of fine tuning there. To say that politicians can bring about some desired beneficial effect to the well-being of a country is a total fallacy. The complexities of any economy being so interdependent and all-pervasive are far too great for any group of people, or any assembly of politicians with some ideological agenda. It is totally impossible.

The policy of governments divorcing themselves from trying to divine the monetary performance of all the players within an economy - every man, woman and child - is the only safe, reliable and responsible path for any political party to follow. Thank heaven it is the policy that will be instituted by the Federal Opposition when next year it becomes the Government. For the first time in the history of our Commonwealth, Australians will be able to look forward to an independent Reserve Bank setting its own interest rates without a political agenda being the prime influence. Then, and only then, will the people of this country be sure that their interests come first. The big message of the 1990s is for Government to get out of the way of commerce and enterprise. There has been no greater blight on the development of Australia than interventionism. Interventionist politics eventually always get it wrong. It may not appear to do so initially but the short-term gains inevitably, finally give way to long-term disaster.

Page 6948

That is why I am a little apprehensive when I read in the Premier's Budget Speech that great faith is being placed in the much improved performance of our government trading enterprise, or GTEs, even though he explains that a close eye will be kept on them. That is fine; they have all been given a big shake out and some have been eliminated. That is just what they needed, and there is no doubt that the State has done the correct thing. GTEs have contributed almost \$1 billion during the past four and a half to five years but in the long term those enterprises must be sold off. The GIO has been sold, and I congratulate Mr George Souris, Minister for Finance and Assistant Treasurer, the Minister responsible for its sale.

The next cab off the rank in 1993-94 is the privatisation of the New South Wales State Bank. If it is eventually sold, it will be sold to a highly competitive and possibly foreign bank. The foreign bank will have the required branch network to give it access to the masses of little funds that are so necessary for any new bank trying to break into the Australian market. Bank deregulation never got off the ground in this country. It failed to break up the Australian banking system. Nothing would be worse than having the New South Wales State Bank swallowed up by one of the existing banks, particularly one of the big four. Let me refer again to the way in which this Government is dealing with the privatisation of government trading enterprises. Generally, public servants do not change their spots when they are put into the private sector. While employed as public servants they are totally incapable of applying themselves to a market situation. However, a great swag of government trading enterprises - Pacific Power, the Maritime Services Board, the Waste Recycling and Processing Service, the Hunter Water Corporation and the Commercial Services Group - are well up on the list for sale.

An excellent example of how we can get it wrong in Sydney is the Sydney Market Authority. While I cannot give a precise agenda, because our masters still cannot sort it out, it is inevitable that the Sydney Market Authority will eventually go the same way as the old Potato Board and the Egg Marketing Board. Bureaucratic organisations that are put in charge of bodies that operate in market-place environments, such as potato boards, milk boards, wheat boards, newspaper vendors, taxicabs, trade unions, car makers, or tobacco boards - it does not matter what they are - develop a

healthy contempt for those they are there to help. They become a means in themselves; they become self-serving, always mindful of their own power bases; and, worst of all, the organisation bears little relationship to what it started out to represent. Why are they doomed to failure? Why will the public and even participants in those organisations eventually turn upon them? All those statutory organisations created by governments, all those businesses or industries that have had simple legislation passed to give protection to some body or section of the economy that deals with private enterprise, have a fundamentally fraudulent and fatal plank in their platform. Government has given those bodies a special licence to legally charge consumers more than could be charged on the open market. They are charging excessively in one place while subsidising in another. In other words, they can demand a higher price for their goods or services than that which would have been paid in the market-place. To put it in the vernacular, when someone has one of these licences he can rip off his fellow citizens without fear of competition or retribution from government. If anyone thinks that is fair or honest government, I am in the wrong place.

I would like to mention the gradual privatisation of the Murrumbidgee Irrigation Area - quite a revolutionary concept for Australia and New South Wales in particular. The Murrumbidgee Irrigation Area would have been one of the worst examples of successive governments neglecting a resource and a commitment to enterprise. The product of all this neglect is a worn-out and broken-down system that requires a lot of

Page 6949

money to be spent on it before it can be handed over to the private sector. Bridges, channels and great tracts of land have to be rehabilitated before the private sector can assume ownership. I commend the Minister for Natural Resources, the Hon. Ian Causley, for his patience and his ability to keep his eye on the ball. Many farmers were understandably suspicious because they had never dealt with bureaucracy. The Coleambally irrigation area, which is in the process of becoming privatised, is a much more modern irrigation area. Degradation of land is being perpetrated not by farmers but by the department. When we find out these sorts of things we realise the amount of work that has to be done. The Minister for Natural Resources has gained the confidence of farmers. Members of the Opposition have tried to stir them up, but to no avail. They well understand what is in store for them as a result of privatisation.

Water prices have gone up and farmers have to learn to cope with a user-pays system, but they have accepted it. Surprisingly, the doom that was being forecast because of increasing water prices has been matched in some sectors by an increase in other prices. Australia still produces 20 per cent of all its wine. Wine production has been spectacular. Orange prices have gone down, but that has occurred on a cyclical basis. Unfortunately, that is one of the bumps with which we will have to contend. I have experienced great heartache in dealing with the Environment Protection Authority. I remember the former Minister for the Environment, Mr Moore, saying that I wanted one in every town. That was never the case. Now that we have the Environment Protection Authority -

Mr Crittenden: Did he have that in writing?

Mr CRUICKSHANK: He did not have that in writing. He gave me a discussion paper long after he said that additional staff would be employed for the Environment Protection Authority. Honourable members opposite can bring up that matter any time they like. The Minister for Natural Resources handled the barramundi fish farm in an exemplary fashion, even though he was presented with many difficulties. It presented no problem for the Environment Protection Authority that developers were losing thousands of dollars every day. I take my hat off to the Minister for the way in

which he handled this project. It is now under way, but only after a lot of heartache and pain. Two other matters have been a source of great agitation within the community. The Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works, and Minister for Roads has seen fit, at long last, after many years of agitation, to supply \$600,000 - not a great deal - towards fixing the Naradhan Road. That road connects Lake Cargelligo to Griffith, the only town in my electorate that is not connected to a major town by an all-weather road. As funds will be provided over a three-year period this problem will finally be rectified.

I commend the Minister for Transport, and Minister for Tourism for opening the Willbriggie line. Sometimes the Government gets a little enthusiastic about the cutting of costs. We were told by the Department of Transport that it was costing \$8,000 a kilometre - \$400,000 a year for 31 kilometres - to maintain that line. I asked people within the department when that road had been repaired. They told me that repairs were carried out on a five-year basis. I again asked when repairs had been carried out and was told, "Eight years ago". After this revelation, the attempt by the department to close the line was brought to the attention of the Minister. The Willbriggie line is again open because a large amount of soft wheat, which is produced in the irrigation area, is vital for the development of the area, for export and for domestic industries. The final paragraph in the Premier's Budget Speech refers to a Government exercise to curb debt. Debt has been gradually reducing. There is no better example of that than the reduction in the operating costs of the State Rail Authority from \$3 million to \$2 million a day.

Page 6950

That is quite a reduction. When our city friends start paying their fair share of the costs of running suburban lines there will be more equity. The Premier concluded by saying that one does not have to be a financial genius or an expert to understand the goals of this Budget Paper. It is simply common sense that if we want to get this nation back on its feet and help those most in need, the unemployed, we can only do so through enterprise. Unless the largest State, New South Wales, shows the lead, the rest of the nation may falter. I support the 1992-93 Budget.

Debate adjourned on motion by Mr Sullivan.

House adjourned at 10.51 p.m.
